DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 145 95 PS 007 645

TITLE	Parent-Child Early Education Program: A Summary of Results During Three Project Years. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Ferguson-Florissant School District, Ferguson, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Plans and Supplementary Centers.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
NOTE	489p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.90 HC-$23.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Early Childhood Education; *Educational Diagnosis; Handicapped Children; Home Instruction; Mental Development; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Participation; Parent School Relationship; Physical Development; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Social Development; Tables (Data); Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This report presents the final evaluation of the Saturday School Program which was designed to fully involve the parents, teaching staff, and children in early childhood education. Results of the third project year as well as a comparison between other project years and a general summation of achievement of program objectives are presented. Students, as a whole, showed growth both in cognitive and affective areas of development. The parents showed increasing positive modes of perceiving and interacting with their children; they also exhibited growth in using appropriate teaching techniques. Likewise, the teachers showed increases in their knowledge of child development, in the use of appropriate teaching techniques, and in establishing positive relationships with parents and children. Specific cognitive, social, emotional, and physical objectives for each of the program's components (the child, the parent, the staff, the handicapped, and the management process) are presented, analyzed statistically, and evaluated. Approximately one-half of the document consists of statistical information. (SDH)

ED 099145

OCT. 15 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

A Summary of Results During
Three Project Years
PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

August 1974

PS 007645

Ferguson-Florissant School District
655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS (Title III, Section 306, ESEA)

FINAL REPORT
1973-74 Project Year

TITLE Parent-Child Early Education Program

SUBMITTED BY: Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2

ADDRESS: 655 January Avenue, Ferguson, Missouri 63135

SUBMITTED TO: Director
Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Washington, D.C. 20202

DATE SUBMITTED: August 28, 1974

Warren M. Brown
Superintendent of Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Evaluation Report

A. Overall Objectives 1

B. Component Objectives

1. The CHILD 4
2. The PARENT 122
3. The STAFF 159
4. The HANDICAPPED 193
5. Management Process 264

C. Summary and Conclusions 267

Interim Educational Audit Report -
April, 1974

Response to the Educational Audit Report -
May, 1974

Appendices

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Evaluation Report

- A. Overall Objectives 1
- B. Component Objectives
  - 1. The CHILD 4
  - 2. The PARENT 122
  - 3. The STAFF 159
  - 4. The HANDICAPPED 193
  - 5. Management Process 264
- C. Summary and Conclusions 267

Interim Educational Audit Report -
April, 1974

Response to the Educational Audit Report -
May, 1974

Appendices

INTRODUCTION

In 1971, when the seeds of many ideas in early education were brought to fruition by members of the Ferguson-Florissant School District in a proposal to the United States Office of Education, certain general objectives were presented. A program was developed on the assumption that three primary groups - parents, schools, and children - must be involved in early education. It was further assumed that these three groups must have an equal influence on program design if the primary target group, the children, were to have their learning problems identified and effectively remediated.

For each of the groups, the program had a primary goal. These goals are reported as follows:

a) At the end of the project funding period, PARENTS will:

   1) believe the schools want to, and can, serve children's individual needs;

   2) improve their competencies in motivating and teaching their children; and

   3) be more aware of the effects of the home environment on the child's development.

b) At the end of the funding period, the CHILD will:

   1) have developed a feeling of higher self esteem as a result of experiencing continuing success through appropriate instruction;

2) have a strong sense of identity with parents because of being helped by them and observing their work in helping other children in the Saturday School; and

3) live in an environment which more closely approaches being supportive of his learning needs.

c) At the end of the funding period, the SCHOOL will:

1) have developed diagnostic instruments and learning activities to meet the individual needs of all students;

2) have developed and successfully communicated to parents a description of those environmental factors, which would at a given point in time, be most conducive to maximizing learning potential; and

3) have developed a functioning input system so that learning activities of both the preschool and school programs are constantly changed as a result of parental and evaluation system feedback.

We believe that the information presented in this report clearly reflects the achievement of those goals both as to the product obtained and the process involved.

I. EVALUATION REPORT

A. Overall Objectives

The overall objectives of the Parent-Child Early Education Program are designed to be achieved within a three year period. Since this is the final evaluation report, results of the third project year are presented as well as a comparison between other project years and a general summation of achievement of program objectives.

The results of the three project years clearly indicate that the Saturday School Program has been effective with the major program components, students, parents, and teaching staff.

THE STUDENTS, as a whole, have shown growth both in cognitive and affective areas of development. Follow-up data on student achievement and adjustment at Kindergarten and Beginning Primary Levels shows that PCEE children achieved higher than children without preschool experience and in many instances higher than children with other preschool experience. The screening and diagnostic testing program has enabled us to identify children with learning disorders or those who may have potential learning problems. As a result, special assistance to the handicapped whether they have evidenced emotional or learning difficulties has resulted in the amelioration of these problems. Follow-up achievement testing indicates that the children identified as having handicaps achieved higher on standardized tests given in kindergarten and beginning primary than children without preschool experience.

THE PARENTS, as a group, have shown increasingly positive modes of perceiving and interacting with their children in Saturday School sessions and in the home environment. They have shown growth in using appropriate teaching techniques including reinforcement procedures and accomplishment of task objectives.

THE TEACHERS have increased in their knowledge of child development, developed in the use of appropriate teaching techniques, and have established positive relationships with parents and children. A supportive staff of consultants has assisted in this development. Continual team planning as an integral part of the teaching job has resulted in growth for the teacher and a stronger educational program.

While it has not proven possible to change 100% of each group on every aspect measured, the program has effected considerable change in the vast majority of pupils, parents, and teachers involved in it.

Furthermore, we believe that the objectives of the program in its various components have resulted in a well rounded alternative plan for early education in which the home and school are joint partners.

B. Evaluation findings for product and process objectives achieved at the end of the past budget period are summarized under components for: THE CHILD, THE PARENT, THE STAFF, THE HANDICAPPED, AND MANAGEMENT PROCESS.

It should be noted that on each rating scale used for evaluation the positive end of the continuum is given the higher figure while the negative end of the continuum is assigned a "one."

1. THE CHILD

a. Product Objective One

> Upon completion of the first year in the Parent-Child Early Education Program, each pupil will exceed his expected growth, as determined by the developmental norm data of each test and by the pupil's original status on that test, by a minimum of one month in the areas of mental development, language development and visual-motor integration.

All pupils who participated in the PCEE Program were administered a battery of three tests designed to obtain measures of pupils' mental, language, and perceptual ages at the beginning of each program year and again, seven months later, at the end of each program year. The tests used were the Slosson Intelligence Test, the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration, and Subtest 3 of the Sievers Differential Language Test (during the first program year), the Northwestern Syntax Scale (during the second program year), or the Grammatic Closure Subtest of the ITPA (during the third program year).

A summary of the results of the initial and final testing for all pupils for whom both pre and posttest scores were obtained during the three project years is given in Table 1. (Please refer to Appendix A for the frequency distributions of the scores obtained on the tests by these pupils.)

Table 1
Results of the Preliminary Screening Batteries Administered at the Beginning and End of Each Program Year to All PCEE Pupils*

Variable		Mean**	Standard Deviation	t***	p	Range of Scores
Mental Age						
Year I	Pre	61.60	10.29	51.03	<.01	24-92
	Post	77.40	10.76			39-112
Year II	Pre	63.29	10.52	53.44	<.01	24-96
	Post	78.95	11.58			24-114
Year III	Pre	62.76	10.46	50.61	<.01	24-100
	Post	77.54	11.83			24-120
Perceptual Age						
Year I	Pre	53.40	10.42	30.79	<.01	33-95
	Post	63.77	10.08			33-112
Year II	Pre	51.22	8.40	10.83	<.01	33-77
	Post	61.80	7.72			33-95
Year III	Pre	51.95	9.44	39.19	<.01	33-82
	Post	64.33	9.55			33-104
Language Age						
Year I	Pre	51.91	11.56	27.58	<.01	24-81
	Post	65.17	10.23			33-84
Year II (Receptive)	Pre	43.68	13.43	31.67	<.01	19-87
	Post	60.62	14.65			19-93
(Expressive)	Pre	43.06	16.03	33.10	<.01	21-93
	Post	59.65	16.22			21-93
Year III	Pre	59.93	12.02	28.99	<.01	24-116
	Post	70.41	12.98			24-120

*The Slosson Intelligence Test was used as the measure of mental age.
The Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration was used as the measure of perceptual age. Subtest 3 of the Sievers was used as the measure of language age during the first project year, the Northwestern Syntax Scale was used during the second project year, and the Grammatic Closure Subtest of the ITPA was used during the third project year. The number of pupils tested twice from the first project year was 752; from the second project year, 648 were tested twice, and 692 pupils were tested twice during the third project year.

**Scores are expressed in units of months.

***Paired observations t tests were used to compare means.

It can be seen in Table 1 that there were statistically significant changes on all tests in the direction of higher mean scores obtained at the end of the year administration than at the beginning of each year. Because the average chronological age of PCEE pupils entering the program each year was 54 months, it was expected that their average mental, language, and perceptual ages would also be approximately 54 months. As the data in Table 1 show, the average entering mental age for all three years was a little more than nine months higher than expected, the average perceptual age was only slightly lower than expected, while the average language age varied widely depending on which language test was used (from nearly 10 months below that expected to nearly six months above that expected). Upon exit from each program year, the average chronological age was 61 months. The average mental age at these times was approximately 78 months, 17 months higher than is usually obtained. The average perceptual age upon exit from the program was 63 months, two months higher than is usually obtained. The average language age upon exit from each program year varied widely: from 60 months (one month below that expected) to more than 70 months (nine months above that expected). Thus, the total sample of all PCEE pupils during the three years of project operation gained, on the average, more than 15 months of mental age, more than 11 months of perceptual age, and between 11 and 17 months of language age depending on which language test was used.

The major goal for the seven month period between test administrations was a gain of at least eight months in mental, language, and perceptual age. In addition, since the primary focus of the program was on the educationally disadvantaged child, it was deemed imperative to compare the gains made by the primary target group with the progress of pupils with higher entering status. Therefore, further analyses were made comparing the rates of change for the bottom third, the middle third, and the top third of the pupils on each of the pre and posttest measures used. A summary of the changes for the total group as well as for the three subsamples is presented below for each of the three program years.

1) First Project Year

a) Mental Age, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test - Of the 752 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of the test, 29 (4%) gained the eight months expected for them during the seven months between testing, 24 (3%) gained nine months, 37 (5%) gained ten months, and 560 (74%) gained eleven or more months in mental age. Twenty-nine pupils (4%) gained seven months of mental age during the seven months between administrations of the test, 70 (9%) gained between one and six months, and three (less than 1%) either showed no gain or regressed in mental age. In sum, a total of 650 pupils (86%) gained the expected eight months of mental age or more during the seven months between test administrations.

On the Slosson Intelligence Test the bottom third of the pupils in the pretest distribution, who had scores of 58 months and below, gained, on the average, 17.65 months of mental age during the seven months between testings. The middle third of the group, who had pretest scores between 59 and 66 months, gained, on the average, 15.90 months; and the top third, who had scores of 67 months and above on the pretest, gained 13.74 months of mental age during the seven months between the administrations of the test. There were, apparently, only small differences in the average rate of growth between the three groups in mental development, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test, however, the greatest rate of gain was achieved by those with the lowest entering status.

b) Language Age, as measured by the Word Association Subtest of the Sievers Test - Of the 752 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of the test, 79 (11%) gained nine months of language age (one more month than that expected for them) and 422 (56%) gained eleven or more months. One hundred and twenty pupils (16%) gained between one and six months of language age during the seven months between administrations and 131 (17%) either did not change their scores or regressed. Altogether, 501 (67%) of the pupils exceeded the expectation of an eight month gain in language age expected for them.

Comparisons made between the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the group in language age showed the bottom third of the pupils had scores of 48 and below on the first administration of the test and gained, on the average, 21.41 months during the seven months between testings. The middle third, who had pretest scores between 49 and 58 months gained an average of 12.48 months, while the top third of the pupils, who had pretest scores of 59 months and above, gained an average of 3.78 months of language age during the seven months between test administrations. In the case of language age, as measured by the Word Association Subtest of the Sievers, there were apparently great differences in gain dependent on pupils' entering status. Pupils with the lowest scores gained three months of language age for each month in the program and pupils with approximately average scores gained not quite two months for each month in the program, whereas, pupils with the highest scores gained the least--less than four months of language age for the seven months in the program.

These dramatic differences in rates of change for the three groups may, in part, be a function of the test used, especially in the case of the students who scored the highest on the first administration of the test. During this first project year, the use of this single subtest of the Sievers was found to be a very limited measure of language development because it does not take into account both the receptive and expressive areas of language. It was originally intended by the Learning Disabilities Specialist to use this subtest as an efficient way of screening learning disabled pupils. However, because it was deemed desirable to measure the language development of all children as a function of the program as well as to screen pupils, and because this single subtest is so limited in scope and has a low ceiling, it was decided that during the second year of project operation The Northwestern Syntax Scale, which yields both expressive and receptive language scores, will be substituted for the Sievers subtest.

c) Perceptual Age, as measured by the Beery Test - Eighteen (2%) of the 752 pupils attained the gain of eight months of perceptual age expected for them, 41

(5%) gained nine months, 33 (4%) gained ten months, and 333 (44%) gained eleven or more months. Seventy-one pupils (9%) gained seven months in perceptual age during the seven months between test administrations, 159 (21%) gained between one and six months, and 97 (13%) either showed no change or regressed in their scores. Altogether, 425 (57%) of the pupils attained or exceeded the eight months of perceptual age expected for them.

Comparisons made between the gains attained by the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the initial distribution on this test showed that the lower third, who had scores of 50 months and below on the pretest, gained an average of 16 months during the seven months between testings. The middle third, who had initial scores between 51 and 58 months, gained an average of 8.44 months; and, the upper third, who scored above 58 months on the pretest, gained an average of 7.39 months of perceptual age. It is apparent that there was a large difference between the gains made by the lowest group and those made by the middle and upper group.

In sum, the various analyses of the data all show that the large majority of PCEE pupils met the criterion of eight months gain, or exceeded it, in the areas of mental, language, and perceptual age during the seven months of project operation. This is especially true for the pupils who initially scored below average for the group on the tests. In this respect, it may be said that the project apparently had a particularly significant impact on the primary target group.

2) Second Project Year

a) Mental Age, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test - Of the 648 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of this test, 26 (4%) gained the eight months expected for them during the seven months between testings, 28 (4%) gained nine months, 28 (4%) gained ten months, and 492 (76%) gained eleven or more months in mental age. Fourteen pupils (2%) gained seven months of mental age during the seven months between administrations of the test, 49 (8%) gained between one and six months, and 11 (2%) either showed no gain or regressed in mental age. Altogether, a total of 574 (89%) gained the expected eight months of mental age or more during the seven months between test administrations.

On the Slosson Intelligence Test the bottom third of the pupils in the pretest distribution, who had scores of 59 months and below, gained, on the average 16.70 months of mental age during the seven months between testings. The middle third of the group, who had pretest scores between 60 and 67 months, gained, on the average 16.01 months; and the top third, who had scores of 68 months and above on the pretest, gained 14.23 months of mental age during the seven months between the administrations of the test. There were, apparently, only small differences in the average rate of growth between the three groups in mental development, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test. However, the greatest rate of gain was achieved by those with the lowest entering status.

b) Language Age, as measured by the Northwestern Syntax Scale.

Receptive Language Age - Of the 648 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of the test, 14 (2%) gained the eight months expected for them during the seven months between testings, 16 (2%) gained nine months, 21 (3%) gained ten months, and 442 (68%) gained eleven or more months. Sixteen pupils (2%) gained seven months of receptive language age during the seven months between administrations, 55 (8%) gained one to six months, and 84 (13%) either did not change their scores or regressed. In sum, 493 (76%) of the pupils met or exceeded the expectation of an eight month gain.

Comparisons made between the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the group showed the bottom third of the pupils had scores of 37 months and below and gained, on the average, 22.82 months of receptive language age during the seven months between testings. The middle third, who had pretest scores of 38 and 48 months gained an average of 16.49 months, while the top third of the pupils, who had pretest scores of 49 and above, gained an average of 11.55 months. There were apparently large differences in gain in receptive language age dependent upon pupils' entering status. Pupils with the lowest scores gained more than three months for each month in the program; the pupils with the middle scores gained more than two months for each month in the program, and the pupils with the highest entering status gained a little more than one and one-half months for each month in the program.

Expressive Language Age - Of the total sample, 24 (4%) gained the eight months of language age expected for them, 22 (3%) gained nine months, 15 (2%) gained ten months, and 445 (69%) gained eleven or more months during the seven months between test administrations. Nine pupils (1%) gained seven months between testings, 60 (9%) gained between one and six months, and 73 (11%) either showed no gain or regressed. In total, 506 (78%) of the pupils equalled or exceeded the expectation of an eight months gain in expressive language age made for them.

Comparisons made between the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the group in expressive language age showed that the bottom third of the pupils, who had scores of 36 and below on the pretest, gained an average of

20.93 months between testings. The middle third, who had pretest scores ranging from 37 to 49 months, gained 17.50 months, while the upper third of the pupils, who had pretest scores of 50 months and above, gained an average of 10.77 months of expressive language age during the seven months between test administrations. Again, there were sizeable differences in gain among the three groups with the pupils with the lowest entering scores gaining about three months for each month in the program, the middle group averaged two and one-half months, and the upper group averaged a little more than one and one-half months for each month in the program.

c) Perceptual Age, as measured by the Beery Test - Twenty-seven (4%) of the 648 pupils attained the gain of eight months of perceptual age expected for them, 24 (4%) gained nine months, 43 (7%) gained ten months, and 300 (46%) gained eleven or more months. Fifty-four pupils (8%) gained seven months, 149 (23%) gained between one and six months, and 51 pupils (8%) either showed no change or regressed in their scores. Altogether, 394 (61%) of the pupils attained or exceeded the eight months of perceptual age expected for them.

Comparisons made between the gains attained by the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the initial distribution on this test showed that the lower third, who had scores of 48 months and below on the pretest, gained an average of 17.09 months during the seven months between testings. The middle third, who had initial scores between 49 and 54 months, gained an average of 9.81 months; and, the upper third, who scored above 56 months on the pretest, gained an average of 6.98 months. There were considerable differences in the average gains of the three groups. The pupils with the lowest entering perceptual age scores gained nearly two and one-half months for each month in the program whereas the middle group gained a little less than one and one-half months and the upper group gained approximately one month for every month in the program.

In summary, the various analyses of the data all show that the large majority of second year PCEE pupils met the criterion of eight months gain, or exceeded it, in the areas of mental, language, and perceptual age during the seven months of project operation. This is especially true for the pupils who initially scored below average for the group in the tests.

3) Third Project Year

a) Mental Age, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test - Of the 692 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of this test, 31 (4%) gained the eight months expected of them during the seven months between testings, 29 (4%) gained nine months, 39 (6%) gained 10 months, and 481 (70%) gained 11 or more months of mental age. Twenty-four pupils (3%) gained seven months of mental age during the seven months between administrations of the test, 72 (10%) gained between one and six months, and 16 (2%) either showed no gain or regressed in mental age. Altogether, a total of 580 (84%) gained the expected eight months of mental age or more during the seven months between test administrations.

On the Slosson Intelligence Test the bottom third of the pupils in the pretest distribution, who had scores of 58 months or below, gained, on the average, 15.39 months of mental age during the seven months between testings. The middle third of the group, who had pretest scores between 59 and 66 months, gained, on the average, 15.04 months; and the top third, who had scores of 67 and above on the pretest, gained an average of 13.95 months of mental age during the seven months between the administrations of the test. There were, apparently, only small differences in the average rate of change between the three groups in mental dev[illegible]-

ment, as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test. However, the greatest rate of gain was achieved by those with the lowest entering scores (more than two months for each month in the program).

b) Language Age, as measured by the Grammatic Closure subtest of the ITPA - Of the 692 pupils obtaining scores on both administrations of the test, 42 (6%) gained the eight months expected for them during the seven months between testings, 18 (3%) gained nine months, 49 (7%) gained 10 months, and 308 (45%) gained 11 or more months. Twenty-six pupils (4%) gained seven months of language age during the seven months between administrations, 159 (23%) gained between one and six months, and 90 (13%) either did not change or regressed in their scores. In total, 417 (60%) met or exceeded the expectation of an eight month gain in language age.

Comparisons made between the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the group showed the bottom third of the pupils had pretest scores of 54 months or below and gained, on the average, 14.06 months of language during the seven months between testings. The middle third, who had pretest scores between 55 and 64 months, gained an average of 9.27 months, while the top third of the pupils, who had pretest scores of 65 months and above, gained an average of 8.62 months. There were apparently moderately large differences in gain in language age dependent upon pupils' entering status. Pupils with the lowest scores gained two months for each month in the program whereas the pupils in the middle and upper thirds gained one and one-fourth months, on the average, for each month in the program.

c) Perceptual Age, as measured by the Beery Test - Twenty-two (3%) of the 692 pupils attained the gain of eight months of perceptual age expected for them, 24 (3%) gained nine months, 41 (6%) gained ten months, and 394 (57%) gained eleven or more months. Forty-six pupils (7%) gained seven months, 119 (17%) gained between one and six months of perceptual age, and 46 (7%) either showed no change or regressed in their scores. In sum, 481 (70%) of the pupils attained or exceeded the eight months of perceptual age expected for them.

Comparisons made between the gains attained by the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the initial distribution on this test showed that the lower third, who had scores of 50 months or below on the pretest, gained an average of 16.22 months during the seven months between test administrations. The middle third, who had initial scores between 51 and 56 months, gained an average of 10.23 months; and, the upper third, who scored 57 or more months on the pretest, gained an average of 10.01 months. There were considerable differences in the average gains of the lower group as compared to those attained by the middle and upper groups. The pupils with the lowest entering perceptual age scores gained more than 2-1/4 months for each month in the program whereas the pupils in the middle and upper groups gained only slightly less than one and one-half months for each month in the program.

In summary, the various analyses of the data from the three project years of operation all show that the vast majority of PCEE pupils met or exceeded the criterion of an eight months gain in the areas of mental, language, and perceptual age during the seven months between test administrations. This was especially true for the pupils who initially scored below average for the groups on the tests.

b. Product Objective Two

> Each primary target group pupil, who was found to be deficient on teacher ratings of the items listed below at the time of entry into the Parent-Child Early Education Program, will show an increase of a minimum of one step on a five-point scale, at the end of the first year in the program, in his:
>
> A. Responsiveness to learning activities presented by the teacher in the Home-teaching sessions.
>
> B. Achievement of the concepts presented during the Home-Teaching sessions.

The consultant specialists to the PCEE Project each year identified those PCEE pupils who belonged in the primary target group; i.e., those who were found to have learning problems due to environmental or biological factors including emotional disorders, learning disabilities, low intellectual functioning, mental retardation, experiential deprivation, and physical disabilities. These pupils were rated by their teachers on scales relating to their responsiveness to learning activities and attainment of objectives during both their first and last home teaching sessions.

The items relating to this objective, together with the N's and percentages for each of the five points of the scales for the three project years are given in Appendix B for this sample as well as for the Total sample and a sample consisting of pupils identified as not belonging to the primary target group. The means, standard deviations, and paired observation t test results, as well as the proportions of pupils judged to be deficient (rated as "3" or less on each five-point scale), for all three project years are given in Table 2.

Table 2
A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Target Group Pupils on Their Responsiveness to Learning Activities and Achievement of Concepts in Home-Teaching Sessions

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient*	
								N	%
Responsiveness to Learning Activities									
1. Outgoing vs. shy	First	330	Initial	3.29	1.26	14.62	<.01	181	55
			Final	4.25	.87			60	18
	Second	281	Initial	3.69	1.33	8.04	<.01	114	41
			Final	4.31	1.00			47	17
	Third	385	Initial	3.83	1.25	7.62	<.01	129	34
			Final	4.25	1.00			77	20
2. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	First	330	Initial	3.60	1.15	12.26	<.01	149	45
			Final	4.41	.82			34	10
	Second	281	Initial	4.05	1.19	5.82	<.01	77	27
			Final	4.46	.81			35	12
	Third	385	Initial	4.16	1.05	4.65	<.01	92	24
			Final	4.41	.80			53	14
3. Talkative vs. hesitant	First	330	Initial	3.18	1.30	14.54	<.01	193	58
			Final	4.21	.91			67	20
	Second	281	Initial	3.70	1.29	8.91	<.01	115	41
			Final	4.35	.89			41	15
	Third	384	Initial	3.78	1.25	7.77	<.01	140	36
			Final	4.22	1.00			82	21
4. Interested vs. disinterested	First	330	Initial	3.91	1.05	11.73	<.01	115	35
			Final	4.65	.66			22	7
	Second	281	Initial	4.28	.96	7.03	<.01	58	21
			Final	4.69	.96			18	6
	Third	385	Initial	4.44	.77	6.04	<.01	48	13
			Final	4.70	.55			15	4

Table 2 (continued)

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient* N	%
5. Attentive vs. distracted	First	330	Initial	3.69	1.18	11.30	<.01	134	40
			Final	4.51	.80			35	11
	Second	281	Initial	4.03	1.14	7.05	<.01	82	29
			Final	4.49	.74			33	12
	Third	385	Initial	4.20	.96	4.04	<.01	90	23
			Final	4.41	.84			48	12
Achievement of Concepts									
1. Attained all vs. none of the objectives	First	330	Initial	3.74	1.08	11.70	<.01	134	40
			Final	4.49	.75			35	11
	Second	281	Initial	3.91	1.10	9.44	<.01	98	35
			Final	4.50	.76			30	11
	Third	385	Initial	4.23	.95	4.46	<.01	89	23
			Final	4.44	.75			45	12

*Deficiency was defined as a rating of "3" or less on each five-point scale.

As can be seen from the results shown in the table, primary target group pupils from all three project years were rated statistically significantly higher on all items pertaining to this objective during the last home teaching session than during the first session. Also, far fewer of these pupils were judged to be deficient in these traits than had been the case at the beginning of the year.

An analysis of individual pupil changes for those pupils initially rated as being deficient on each of the items is given below for each project year.

Responsiveness to Learning Activities

1) Outgoing versus shy

a) First Project Year - Of the 330 pupils receiving teacher ratings on both first and last home teaching sessions, 181 (55%) were judged to be initially deficient on this scale. Of these 181 pupils, 65 (36%) gained one step, 67 (37%) gained two steps, and 34 (19%) gained three or more steps on this scale at the last home session. Altogether, 166 (92%) of the pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain on this trait.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 281 pupils rated twice, 114 (41%) were judged to be deficient on this scale initially. Of these 114 pupils, 32 (28%) gained one step, 41 (36%) gained two steps, and 21 (18%) gained three or more steps on this scale during the last home session. In sum, 94 pupils (82%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain on this trait.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 385 pupils rated both at the first and last home teaching sessions, 129 (34%) were rated as being initially deficient in this trait. Of these 129 pupils, 48 (37%) gained one step, 34 (26%) gained two steps, and 15 (12%) gained three or more steps on this scale at the last home session. In total, 97 (75%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their ratings.

2) Cooperative versus uncooperative

a) First Project Year - One hundred and forty-nine (45%) of the 330 primary target group pupils were rated as deficient on this scale during the first home visit. Of the 149 pupils, 32 (21%) gained one step, 73 (49%) gained two steps, and 23 (15%) gained three or more steps in their cooperativeness as rated during the last home session. Altogether, 128 (86%) of the pupils considered initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Seventy-seven pupils (27%) of the 281 pupils were rated as "3" or below on this five-point scale during the first home session. Of the 77 pupils, 21 (27%) gained one step, 27 (35%) gained two steps, and 17 (22%) gained three or more steps in ratings received during the last home visit. In sum, 65 (84%) of the pupils rated as initially deficient in cooperation met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

c) Third Project Year - Ninety-two pupils (24%) of the 385 pupils were rated as "3" or below on this five-point scale initially. Of these 92 pupils, 28 (30%) gained one step, 36 (39%) gained two steps, and 10 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 74 (80%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient in cooperation met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

3) Talkative versus hesitant

a) First Project Year - One hundred and ninety-three (58%) of the 330 primary target group pupils were rated as deficient in this trait during the first home visit. Of the 193 pupils, 55 (28%) gained one step, 66 (34%) gained two steps, and 47 (24%) gained three or more steps in the ratings received during the last home visit. In total, 168 (87%) of the pupils initially rated as deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

b) Second Project Year - One hundred and fifteen (41%) of the 281 pupils were rated as deficient in this trait initially. Of the 115 pupils, 36 (31%) gained one step, 40 (35%) gained two steps, and 22 (19%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 98 (85%) of the pupils initially judged to be deficient met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

c) Third Project Year - One hundred and forty (36%) of the 385 pupils were rated as initially deficient on this scale. Of the 140 pupils, 53 (38%) gained one step, 35 (25%) gained two steps, and 17 (12%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 105 (75%) of the pupils judged to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

4) Interested versus disinterested

a) First Project Year - One hundred and fifteen (35%) of the 330 primary target group pupils were rated as being initially deficient on this scale. Of the 115 pupils, 25 (22%) gained one step, 63 (55%) gained two steps, and 19 (17%) gained three or more steps in their display of interest during the last home teaching session. Altogether, 107 (93%) of the pupils rated as initially deficient in interest in the session met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Fifty-eight (21%) of the 281 primary target group pupils were rated as being initially deficient on this scale. Of these 58 pupils, 13 (22%) gained one step, 31 (53%) gained two steps, and seven (12%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 51 (88%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient in their display of interest met or exceeded the criterion.

c) Third Project Year - Forty-eight (13%) of the 385 pupils were judged to be initially deficient in their display of interest in the teaching session. Of these 48 pupils, 14 (29%) gained one step, 25 (52%) gained two steps, and four (8%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 43 (89%) of those pupils rated as initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

5) Attentive versus distracted

a) First Project Year - One hundred and thirty-four (40%) of the 330 pupils were rated as being deficient in attention during the first home teaching session. Of these 134 pupils, 24 (18%) gained one step, 68 (51%) gained two steps, and 80 (22%) gained three or more steps in their attentiveness during the last home teaching session. In total, 122 (91%) of the pupils initially rated as deficient in this trait, met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Eighty-two (29%) of the 281 pupils were rated as being initially deficient in this trait. Of these 82 pupils, 25 (30%) gained one step, 33 (40%) gained two steps, and 13 (16%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 71 (87%) of the pupils initially judged as deficient in attentiveness met or exceeded the criterion.

c) Third Project Year - Ninety (23%) of the 385 pupils were judged to be initially deficient in this trait. Of these 90 pupils, 35 (39%) gained one step, 32 (36%) gained two steps, and six (7%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 73 (82%) of the pupils found to be initially deficient in their attentiveness met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

Achievement of Concepts

1) Attained objectives (all versus none)

a) First Project Year - One hundred and thirty-five (40%) of the 330 primary target group pupils were rated as attaining 50% or fewer of the objectives during the first home teaching session. Of these 134 pupils, 38 (28%) gained one step, 63 (47%) gained two steps, and 22 (16%) gained three or more steps in their attainment of objectives as measured during the last home visit. In total, 123 (92%) of the pupils considered to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Ninety-eight (35%) of the 281 pupils were rated as attaining 50% or fewer of the objectives during the first home visit. Of these 98 pupils, 30 (31%) gained one step, 47 (48%) gained two steps, and 10 (10%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 87 (89%) of the primary target group pupils judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

c) Third Project Year - Eighty-nine (23%) of the 385 pupils were rated as attaining 50% or fewer of the objectives during the initial home session. Of these 89 pupils, 39 (44%) gained one step, 26 (29%) gained two steps, and six (7%) gained three steps. Altogether, 71 (80%) of the pupils judged to be initially deficient in their attainment of objectives met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

In general, the large majority (between 75% and 93%) of the primary target group pupils judged to be initially deficient on the scales relating to this objective met the criterion of a minimum increase of one step in their final ratings. In terms of meeting these criteria, the findings of the three project years are fairly similar. The primary differences between the findings of the three years are that: 1) fewer pupils in each successive project year were judged to be initially deficient on the six rating scales; and, 2) slightly fewer of these target group pupils attained the criterion set for them in succeeding project years.

c. Product Objective Three

> Each primary target group pupil, who was found to be rated as having less than very positive attitudes toward school by the teacher at the beginning of the Parent-Child Early Education Program, will increase by at least one step on a five-point rating scale in the positiveness of his attitudes toward school at the end of his first year in the program.

Pupils in the primary target group received ratings by their teachers on their attitudes toward Saturday School during both their first and last home teaching sessions. A summary of the results comparing pupils' ratings at the beginning and end of the year, for all three project years, may be found in Table 3.

Table 3
A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Target Group PCEE Pupils on Their Attitudes Toward Saturday School

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Attitudes Toward Saturday School: Positive vs. Negative	First	330	Initial	3.84	1.08	13.07	$<.01$	121	37
			Final	4.65	.64			24	7
	Second	281	Initial	4.11	1.15	7.75	$<.01$	79	28
			Final	4.62	.72			24	9
	Third	383	Initial	4.35	.91	5.82	$<.01$	67	17
			Final	4.62	.70			29	8

It can be seen that in all three project years there were statistically significant changes toward the more positive end of the five-point rating scale during the time of the final ratings. There were also correspondingly smaller proportions of pupils judged to be deficient in their attitudes at the end of each year than there had been at the beginning.

An analysis of individual changes for those pupils initially judged to be deficient in their attitudes (i.e., a rating of "3" or less) is given below by year:

First Project Year

Of the 330 target group pupils rated both initially and finally, 121 (37%) were judged to be initially deficient in their attitudes toward Saturday School. Of these 121 pupils, 24 (20%) gained one step, 65 (54%) gained two steps, and 23 (19%) gained three or more steps on their final ratings on this scale. Altogether, 112 (93%) of those pupils considered initially deficient in their attitudes met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

Second Project Year

Of the 281 primary target group pupils rated twice, 79 (28%) were judged to be initially deficient in their attitudes toward Saturday School. Of these 79 pupils, 13 (16%) gained one step, 42 (35%) gained two steps, and 13 (16%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings on this five-point scale. In total, 68 (86%) of those pupils rated as initially deficient in their attitudes met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in the positiveness of their attitudes.

Third Project Year

Of the 383 primary target group pupils rated during both first and last home visits, 67 (17%) were rated as being initially deficient. Of these 67 pupils, 25 (37%) gained one step, 26 (39%) gained two steps, and six (9%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 57 (85%) of those pupils rated as initially deficient in the positiveness of their attitudes toward Saturday School met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

In general, decreasing proportions of target group pupils were found to be initially deficient in their attitudes toward Saturday School (37% during the first year, 28% during the second year, and 17% during the third year). The proportions of pupils judged to be deficient at the end of the year were virtually identical (between 7% and 9%). At least 85% of those pupils judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their end of the year ratings. These findings would seem to indicate that the vast majority of pupils with learning problems due to a variety of causes were, by the end of each project year, expressing very positive attitudes toward Saturday School.

d. Product Objective Four (Revised 8/71)

> Each pupil, who was rated on any of the five scales on the Rating Scale of Self Esteem as having less than average self esteem by his teacher at the beginning of the Parent-Child Early Education Program, will increase by at least one step on each of those scales by the end of his first year in the Program.

All PCEE pupils were rated by their teachers on five five-point scales taken from Coopersmith's "Behavior Rating Form" both at the beginning and end of each PCEE project year. The items relating to this objective, together with *N*'s and percentages for each point of the scale, are given in Appendix C. The means, standard deviations, paired observations *t* test results, as well as the proportions of pupils judged to be deficient (rated as less than "3") on each scale, are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings
of Pupils' Self Esteem

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient**	
								N	%
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities	First	755	Pre	3.42	.89	10.36	<.01	122	16
			Post	3.76	.81			60	8
	Second	649	Pre	3.41	.99	4.95	<.01	124	19
			Post	3.58	.84			76	12
	Third	685	Pre	3.55	.92	1.22	n.s.	98	14
			Post	3.58	.83			72	11
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing	First	755	Pre	2.62	.90	2.01	<.05	84	11
			Post	2.70	.93			85	11
	Second	649	Pre	2.51	.97	<1	n.s.	103	16
			Post	2.49	.98			104	16
	Third	685	Pre	2.64	.97	-1.92	n.s.	87	13
			Post	2.57	.87			77	11
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well	First	755	Pre	2.51	.83	5.34	<.01	88	12
			Post	2.72	.86			69	9
	Second	649	Pre	2.47	.99	1.81	n.s.	110	17
			Post	2.55	.97			110	17
	Third	685	Pre	2.84	1.00	-4.92	<.01	72	11
			Post	2.56	.85			86	13

continued

Table 4 (continued)

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient**	
								N	%
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises	First	755	Pre	2.80	.98	4.50	<.01	88	12
			Post	2.97	.97			57	8
	Second	649	Pre	2.76	1.06	<1	n.s.	89	14
			Post	2.77	1.07			84	13
	Third	685	Pre	2.84	.98	-2.23	<.05	81	12
			Post	2.76	.92			63	9
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness	First	755	Pre	3.19	.88	10.93	<.01	140	19
			Post	3.57	.91			91	12
	Second	649	Pre	3.18	.97	7.13	<.01	140	22
			Post	3.44	.97			107	16
	Third	685	Pre	3.23	.93	4.02	<.01	133	19
			Post	3.48	.93			90	13

*It should be noted that "5" represents the positive end of the continuum represented by each scale.

**Deficiency was defined as a rating of less than "3" on each five-point scale.

Inspection of the table shows that the results from the three project years were quite different. In the first project year PCEE pupils were rated as having improved their standing on all five scales by the end of the program year. In the second project year PCEE pupils were rated as having changed positively on two of the five scales. During the third and last project year, teachers rated pupils at the end of the year higher on one of the five scales and lower on two of the scales than had been the case at the beginning of the year. The one item on which there appeared positive changes during all three years concerned itself with the extent to which the child showed a sense of self esteem. This scale appears to be a global rating while the other four scales seem to refer to specific behaviors which may represent only isolated aspects of the global concept of self esteem.

Analyses of individual changes for those pupils judged to be initially deficient on each of the rating scales showed the following:

1) Child adapts easily to new situations

a) First Project Year - One hundred and twenty-two pupils (16%) of the 755 were judged to be initially deficient (rated as "two" or less) on this scale. Of these 122 pupils, 50 (41%) gained one step, 45 (37%)

gained two steps, 6 (5%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 101 (83%) of the pupils rated as initially deficient in their ease of adapting to new situations gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - One hundred and twenty-four (19%) of the 649 were judged to be initially deficient (rated as "two" or less) on this scale. Of these 124 pupils, 53 (43%) gained one step, 26 (21%) gained two steps, and eight (6%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 87 (70%) of the pupils rated as initially deficient in the ease of adapting to new situations gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Ninety-eight (14%) of the pupils were rated as being initially deficient on this five-point scale. Of these 98 pupils, 50 (51%) gained one step, 19 (19%) gained two steps, and two (2%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 71 (72%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

2) Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses

a) First Project Year - Of the 84 pupils (11%) rated as initially deficient in this trait, 19 (23%) gained one step, 30 (36%) gained two steps, and 13 (15%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 62 (74%) of the pupils judged to become too easily upset by failures at the beginning of the year gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the program year. It should be noted that 56 pupils who were not initially judged to be deficient (rated as "two" or less) became so in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 103 (16%) pupils rated as initially deficient in this trait, 45 (44%) gained one step, 25 (24%) gained two steps, and 5 (5%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 75 (73%) of the pupils judged to become too easily upset by failures at the beginning of the year gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the program year. It should be noted that 21 pupils who were not initially judged to be deficient (rated as "two" or less) became so in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 87 (13%) pupils initially judged to be deficient on this scale, 34 (39%) gained one step, and 28 (32%) gained two or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 62 (71%) of those pupils rated as being initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion.

3) Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher

a) First Project Year - Eighty-eight (12%) of the pupils were initially judged to be deficient in this trait. Of the 88 pupils, 33 (38%) gained one step, 23 (26%) gained two steps, and 11 (12%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. Altogether, 67 (76%) of those pupils rated as seeking too much support and reassurance initially gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the program year. It should be noted that 28 pupils who were not initially judged to be deficient became so in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - One hundred and ten (17%) of the pupils were initially judged to be deficient in this trait. Of these 110 pupils, 27 (25%) gained one step, 31 (28%) gained two steps, and 12 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. Altogether, 70 (64%) of those pupils rated as seeking too much support and reassurance initially gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the program year. It should be noted that 35 pupils who were not initially judged to be deficient became so in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 72 (11%) pupils initially rated as being deficient on this scale, 26 (36%)

gained one step and 13 (18%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 39 (54%) of those pupils initially judged as deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion.

4) Child continually seeks attention

a) First Project Year - Eighty-eight (12%) of the pupils were initially rated as being deficient on this scale. Of the 88 pupils, 33 (38%) gained one step, 19 (22%) gained two steps, and 12 (14%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. Altogether, 64 (73%) of the pupils judged to be continually seeking attention initially gained one or more steps in the direction of seeking less attention at the end of the program year. It should be noted that 28 pupils not initially rated as being deficient on this trait became so in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Eighty-nine (14%) of the pupils were rated as being initially deficient on this scale. Of these 89 pupils, 29 (33%) gained one step, 17 (19%) gained two steps, and 10 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. In total, 56 (63%) of the pupils judged to be continually seeking attention initially gained one or more steps in the direction of seeking less attention at the end of the second program year. It should be noted that 24 pupils not initially rated as being deficient on this trait became so in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 81 pupils (12%) judged to be initially deficient in this trait, 37 (46%) gained one step and 18 (22%) gained two or more steps on their final ratings. In total, 55 (68%) of those pupils rated as being initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion.

5) Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem

a) First Project Year - Of the 755 pupils receiving both initial and final ratings on this scale, 140 (19%) were judged to be deficient initially. Of these 140 pupils, 59 (42%) gained one step, 33 (24%) gained two steps, and 15 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 107 (76%) of the pupils judged to be deficient in their sense of self-esteem at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in this trait at the end of the year. It should be noted that 46 pupils not initially judged to be deficient on this trait became so in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 649 pupils receiving both initial and final ratings on this scale, 140 (22%) were judged to be deficient initially. Of these 140 pupils, 70 (50%) gained one step, 29 (21%) gained two steps, and three (2%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 102 (73%) of the pupils judged to be deficient in their sense of self esteem at the beginning of the second program year gained one or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 133 pupils (19%) initially rated as deficient in their self-esteem, 65 (49%) gained one step, 20 (15%) gained two steps, and eight (6%) gained three steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 93 (70%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain expected for them.

In general, a substantial majority (54% to 83%) of the pupils judged to be initially deficient on the five rating scales related to this objective met the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings. On the rating scale which is probably the most closely tied to the objective, (i.e., the fifth and final scale) between 70% and 76% met the criterion.

Additional Analyses

Pupils from the first two project years were followed up into kindergarten where they were rated on all five scales by their kindergarten teachers and compared to control group pupils who entered kindergarten at the same time but who had no preschool experience of any kind. In addition, pupils from the first project year were followed up into first grade where they were again rated by their first grade teachers and compared to pupils entering first grade at the same time who had no preschool experience. A summary of the results of these analyses is given in Table 5.

Table 5
Results of Analyses of Variance Comparing First and Second Program Year PCEE Pupils and Control Group Pupils on "The Self Esteem Scale" at the Beginning of the Kindergarten Year and First Grade

Item	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities	First	Kdg.	PCEE	679	3.79	.86	3.25	n.s.
			Control	306	3.68	.93		
	First	1st Gr.	PCEE	484	3.60	.82	4.00	<.05
			Control	271	3.47	.91		
	Second	Kdg.	PCEE	599	3.67	.87	3.09	n.s.
			Control	185	3.54	.87		
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing	First	Kdg.	PCEE	679	3.86	.94	<1	n.s.
			Control	306	3.85	.96		
	First	1st Gr.	PCEE	484	3.61	.92	<1	n.s.
			Control	271	3.55	.96		
	Second	Kdg.	PCEE	599	3.72	.98	1.20	n.s.
			Control	185	3.63	.92		
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	First	Kdg.	PCEE	679	3.73	.98	2.54	n.s.
			Control	306	3.62	1.03		
	First	1st Gr.	PCEE	484	3.35	.91	4.34	<.05
			Control	271	3.20	1.01		
	Second	Kdg.	PCEE	599	3.44	.95	<1	n.s.
			Control	185	3.36	.93		

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises	First	Kdg.	PCEE	679	4.01	1.01	<1	n.s.
			Control	306	3.94	1.09		
	First	1st Gr.	PCEE	484	3.85	1.03	12.25	<.005
			Control	271	3.57	1.09		
	Second	Kdg.	PCEE	599	3.86	1.14	2.55	n.s.
			Control	185	3.71	1.03		
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness	First	Kdg.	PCEE	679	3.42	.96	3.76	n.s.
			Control	306	3.29	.97		
	First	1st Gr.	PCEE	484	3.29	.90	3.35	n.s.
			Control	271	3.16	.99		
	Second	Kdg.	PCEE	599	3.16	.98	4.94	<.05
			Control	185	2.98	.90		

It can be seen that kindergarten teachers rated PCEE pupils and their controls as being essentially the same with regard to various aspects of self-esteem with but one exception. The exception occurred on the global rating scale of self-esteem where kindergarten teachers rated second year PCEE pupils as displaying a greater sense of self-esteem than did control group pupils. First grade teachers, on the other hand rated PCEE pupils higher on three of the five rating scales than they did the control group. First grade teachers apparently saw PCEE pupils as adapting more easily to new situations and seeking less support, reassurance, and attention than the control group pupils. There were no differences, however, in their global ratings of self-esteem for the two groups.

e. Product Objective Five

> Each child in the Parent-Child Early Education Program who was found to be deficient on parent ratings of items in the developmental areas listed below at the time of entry into the program, will show an increase of a minimum of one step on a five-point scale, at the time of entry into kindergarten, in his achievement of: Personal and Social Development; e.g., ability to follow simple directions; take good care of things he uses; take turns with other children; Language and Concept Development; e.g., speak in sentences; tell color of things; identify letters of the alphabet; Physical Skill Development; e.g., run, hop, and jump; clap or march to music; build structures with blocks or construction toys.

All PCEE Program pupils were rated by their parents prior to the beginning of the PCEE Program year, using a behavior checklist entitled, "Introducing My Preschool Child" and prior to entry into kindergarten, using a similar checklist entitled, "Introducing My Kindergarten Child." There were 28 three-point rating scales relevant to this objective that were common to both checklists. Two samples of pupils were thus rated: those who had participated in the first year of project operation and those who had participated in the second year.

The *N*'s and percentages for each point of each scale are given in Appendix D for both project years. A summary of results comparing the ratings of pupils prior to entry into the PCEE Program to those obtained prior to entry into kindergarten for both project years is given in Table 6. Differences between means were evaluated using paired observations *t* tests. Proportions of pupils judged to be deficient both initially and finally are also given. (Deficiency was defined as a rating of "1" or "0" on each three-point scale.)

Table 6

A Summary of Initial and Final Parent Ratings on Their Children's Status in the Areas of Personal and Social Development, Language and Concept Development, and Motor Skill Development

Scale*	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT									
1. Child snaps, buttons, and zips clothing	First	591	Initial	1.46	.59	14.52	<.01	295	50
			Final	1.31	.40			104	18
	Second	441	Initial	1.48	.57	12.45	<.01	212	48
			Final	1.81	.43			76	17
2. Child goes to toilet by himself	First	593	Initial	1.93	.41	2.10	<.05	43	7
			Final	1.97	.18			17	3
	Second	441	Initial	1.93	.26	3.22	<.01	29	7
			Final	1.97	.16			6	1
3. Child takes good care of things he uses	First	590	Initial	1.43	.58	7.97	<.01	320	53
			Final	1.61	.49			226	37
	Second	441	Initial	1.41	.57	7.83	<.01	244	55
			Final	1.62	.49			166	38
4. Child pays attention and concentrates well	First	588	Initial	1.32	.53	4.14	<.01	382	65
			Final	1.42	.51			335	57
	Second	441	Initial	1.38	.51	3.81	<.01	269	61
			Final	1.48	.52			224	51
5. Child follows simple directions without reminding	First	592	Initial	1.40	.57	3.89	<.01	352	59
			Final	1.50	.51			291	49
	Second	441	Initial	1.39	.52	4.74	<.01	202	46
			Final	1.54	.51			202	46

(Continued)

Table 6 (continued)

Scale*	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
6. Child tells what he wants or needs	First	593	Initial	1.94	.36	-1.41	n.s.	40	7
			Final	1.92	.28			50	8
	Second	441	Initial	1.91	.31	<1	n.s.	38	9
			Final	1.92	.28			37	8
7. Child takes turns and shares	First	593	Initial	1.47	.56	5.74	<.01	318	54
			Final	1.61	.50			231	39
	Second	441	Initial	1.45	.51	5.51	<.01	238	54
			Final	1.61	.49			170	39
8. Child remembers rules of games he plays	First	587	Initial	1.25	.62	11.42	<.01	388	66
			Final	1.55	.54			253	43
	Second	441	Initial	1.26	.62	11.67	<.01	281	64
			Final	1.63	.50			161	37
9. Child helps with simple household jobs	First	592	Initial	1.51	.55	1.98	<.05	276	47
			Final	1.56	.51			254	43
	Second	440	Initial	1.48	.52	2.57	<.05	223	51
			Final	1.56	.52			189	43
LANGUAGE AND CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT									
1. Child speaks in sentences of five or more words	First	593	Initial	1.91	.32	4.61	<.01	50	8
			Final	1.96	.20			21	4
	Second	441	Initial	1.95	.25	2.41	<.05	22	5
			Final	1.98	.15			10	2
2. Child identifies six or more colors	First	588	Initial	1.57	.72	13.20	<.01	172	29
			Final	1.94	.29			30	5
	Second	442	Initial	1.55	.72	5.57	<.01	140	32
			Final	1.76	.46			100	23

(Continued)

Table 6 (continued)

	Project				Standard			Deficient	
Scale*	Year	N		Mean	Deviation	t	p	N	%
3. Child recites rhymes, sings songs	First	589	Initial	1.49	.65	9.22	<.01	257	44
			Final	1.70	.50			163	28
	Second	442	Initial	1.48	.61	14.89	<.01	203	46
			Final	1.94	.29			23	5
4. Child tells how things are alike or different	First	589	Initial	1.44	.63	11.55	<.01	293	50
			Final	1.74	.46			152	26
	Second	441	Initial	1.50	.59	8.99	<.01	200	45
			Final	1.77	.43			100	23
5. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	First	572	Initial	1.28	.81	16.71	<.01	287	50
			Final	1.79	.48			101	18
	Second	441	Initial	1.40	.74	13.96	<.01	197	45
			Final	1.84	.41			62	14
6. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	First	580	Initial	.85	.91	17.14	<.01	381	66
			Final	1.45	.81			200	34
	Second	440	Initial	.89	.88	16.17	<.01	293	67
			Final	1.55	.75			131	30
7. Child prints his first name correctly	First	589	Initial	.62	.84	27.24	<.01	457	78
			Final	1.63	.63			169	29
	Second	441	Initial	.69	.86	24.32	<.01	325	74
			Final	1.75	.51			97	22
8. Child tells his whole name	First	586	Initial	1.70	.60	10.52	<.01	138	24
			Final	1.96	.23			20	3
	Second	441	Initial	1.70	.61	8.24	<.01	96	22
			Final	1.95	.23			24	5

(Continued)

Table 6 (continued)

Scale*	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
9. Child tells his address	First	576	Initial	.77	.81	19.45	<.01	448	78
			Final	1.47	.72			231	40
	Second	441	Initial	.76	.82	15.22	<.01	334	76
			Final	1.40	.74			196	44
10. Child tells his telephone number	First	575	Initial	.32	.66	20.09	<.01	521	91
			Final	1.10	.89			316	55
	Second	440	Initial	.37	.69	16.10	<.01	386	88
			Final	1.07	.90			245	56
11. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	First	590	Initial	1.66	.65	10.48	<.01	144	24
			Final	1.93	.29			32	5
	Second	441	Initial	1.68	.60	10.47	<.01	110	25
			Final	1.98	.15			7	2
MOTOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT									
1. Child can ride a tricycle or bicycle	First	590	Initial	1.98	.18	<1	n.s.	11	2
			Final	1.97	.21			12	2
	Second	441	Initial	1.95	.23	2.30	<.05	18	4
			Final	1.98	.18			6	1
2. Child runs, hops and jumps	First	591	Initial	1.96	.19	1.15	n.s.	22	4
			Final	1.97	.17			14	2
	Second	441	Initial	1.95	.23	3.59	<.01	22	5
			Final	1.99	.12			6	1

(Continued)

Table 6 (continued)

Scale*	Project				Standard			Deficient	
	Year	N		Mean	Deviation	t	p	N	%
3. Child claps or marches in time to music	First	589	Initial	1.59	.58	6.17	<.01	214	36
			Final	1.74	.48			140	24
	Second	441	Initial	1.63	.56	4.42	<.01	143	32
			Final	1.76	.46			100	23
4. Child uses scissors with control	First	588	Initial	1.16	.73	16.41	<.01	384	65
			Final	1.64	.53			198	34
	Second	441	Initial	1.16	.74	14.22	<.01	279	63
			Final	1.65	.54			140	32
INTERESTS AND EXPERIENCES									
1. Child is read to	First	585	Initial	1.56	.53	<1	n.s.	247	42
			Final	1.56	.52			254	43
	Second	437	Initial	1.61	.51	-1.45	n.s.	167	38
			Final	1.57	.53			180	41
2. Child goes to library	First	587	Initial	1.07	.84	-2.19	<.05	357	61
			Final	1.01	.74			427	73
	Second	438	Initial	1.08	.81	-2.82	<.01	275	63
			Final	.98	.73			324	74
3. Child watches Sesame Street	First	586	Initial	1.47	.63	2.38	<.05	271	46
			Final	1.53	.58			249	42
	Second	438	Initial	1.50	.63	3.99	<.01	189	43
			Final	1.62	.54			155	35
4. Child takes trips outside the community	First	586	Initial	1.60	.54	-2.20	<.05	221	38
			Final	1.54	.55			254	43
	Second	438	Initial	1.54	.59	-1.45	n.s.	177	40
			Final	1.50	.56			206	47

*All scales were scored as follows: 2 = regularly; 1 = sometimes; and, 0 = not yet. Deficiency was defined as a score of 1 or 2.

It can be seen in Table 6 that parents generally rated their children higher in the areas of personal and social development, as well as in motor skill development and language and concept development, at the time of entry into kindergarten than they had one year earlier (prior to entry into the PCEE Program). These findings may be inferred from the statistically significant t test results and the differences in the proportions of pupils found to be deficient in the items at the two different times of rating. There were mixed results in the area of interests and experiences where in three instances there were reversals with parents rating pupils higher prior to entry into the PCEE Program than into kindergarten. Altogether, of the 28 rating scales compared, there were 19 statistically significant t test results using first project year pupils and 22 significant t test results using second project year pupils showing higher parental ratings in skill development and behavior at the time of entry into kindergarten compared to that exhibited one year earlier by children. Of the 28 comparisons, seven were not statistically significant for first project year pupils and five were not significant for second year pupils. Only two of the 28 items showed a reversal with higher ratings given initially for first year pupils and only one of the 28 items showed a reversal for second year pupils.

Parents rated their children from both project years higher after the PCEE project on all of the 11 items in the area of language and concept development and on eight of the nine items in the area of personal and social development. There were some differences between the project years in the area of motor skill development. Pupils in the first project year were rated higher upon entry into kindergarten on two of the four items in the motor skill area whereas second project year pupils were rated higher on all items in that area.

An analysis of individual changes made for those pupils found to be deficient at the time of entry into the PCEE Program are given below for both project years.

Personal and Social Development

1) Child snaps, buttons, and zips clothing

a) First Project Year - Of the 591 pupils rated on this scale both in 1971 and 1972, 295 (50%) were judged to be initially deficient in this skill. Of the 295 pupils, 207 (70%) gained one step and 11 (4%) gained two steps. Altogether, 218 (74%) of the pupils identified as deficient at the time of entry into the PCEE Program gained one or more steps in their ratings by the time of entry into kindergarten.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated on this scale both in 1972 and 1973, 212 (48%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 212 pupils, 142 (67%) gained one step and seven (3%) gained two steps. Altogether, 149 (70%) of the pupils identified as deficient at the time of entry into the PCEE Program gained one or more steps in their ratings by the time of entry into kindergarten as compared with 74% of the pupils from the first project year.

2) Child goes to the toilet by himself

a) First Project Year - Of the 593 pupils rated on this scale both in 1971 and 1972, 43 (73%) were judged as being initially deficient in this behavior. Of the 43 pupils, 37 (86%) gained one step and one (2%) gained two steps. Altogether, 38 (88%) of the pupils identified as deficient at the time of entry into the PCEE Program gained one or more steps in their ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated on this scale twice, 29 (7%) were judged as being initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 29 pupils, 23 (79%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain by the time of entry into kindergarten as compared with 88% of the pupils who met or exceeded the criterion in the previous year.

3) Child takes good care of things he uses

a) First Project Year - Of the 590 pupils rated on this scale, 320 (54%) were judged to be initially deficient in this trait. Of the 320 pupils, 146 (46%) gained one step and 3 (1%) gained two steps. In total, 149 (47%) of those judged deficient gained one or more steps by the time of entry into kindergarten.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated on this scale, two times, 244 (55%) were judged to be initially deficient on this trait. Of these 244 pupils, 124 (51%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain on this three-point rating scale. This finding compares with 47% of the pupils who met or exceeded the criterion in the preceding year.

4) Child pays attention and concentrates well

a) First Project Year - Of the 588 pupils rated on this scale both in 1971 and 1972, 382 (65%) were rated as deficient in this behavior. Of these 382 pupils, 124 (32%) gained one step and 2 (1%) gained two steps. Altogether, 126 pupils (33%) met the criterion of an increase of one or more steps.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 269 (61%) were found to be initially deficient in these behaviors. Of these 269 pupils, 100 (37%) met or exceeded the criterion on their final ratings as compared to 33% of the pupils who met or exceeded the criterion during the previous year. It should be noted that 50 pupils, not initially deficient became so in their final ratings during the second year.

5. Child follows simple directions without reminding

a) First Project Year - Of the 592 pupils rated twice on this scale, 352 (59%) were rated as being deficient in this trait. Of these 352 pupils, 146 (41%) met the criterion of a one step gain on this three-point scale.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 202 (46%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 202 pupils, 118 (58%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings. This finding compares favorably with last year's where 41% of the pupils met the criterion. It should be noted that 56 pupils who were not originally deficient were judged to become so in their final ratings this year.

6) Child tells what he wants or needs

a) First Project Year - Of the 593 pupils rated twice on this scale, 40 (7%) were rated as "0" or "1." Of these 40 pupils, 31 (78%) gained one step and 1 (2%) gained two steps. In sum, 31 pupils (80%) met the criterion of a one-step gain or more on this behavior as reported by their parents.

b) Second Project Year - Thirty-eight (9%) of the 441 pupils rated at both times were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 38 pupils, 31 (82%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings of this trait. This finding is similar to that of last year with 80% of initially deficient pupils meeting or exceeding the criterion set for them.

7) Child takes turns and shares

a) First Project Year - Of the 593 pupils rated on this three-point scale both times, 318 (54%) were judged to be deficient on the first rating. Of these 318 pupils, 145 (46%) met the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice on this scale, 238 (54%) were initially rated as deficient. Of these 238 pupils, 121 (51%) met the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings as compared with 46% of the pupils in the first project year.

8) Child remembers rules of games he plays

a) First Project Year - Of the 587 pupils rated by their parents on both administrations of the behavior checklist, 388 (66%) were judged to be initially deficient on this scale. Of these 388 pupils, 184 (47%) gained one step and 16 (4%) gained two steps in their second rating of this trait. Altogether, 200 (52%) pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings of this trait.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 439 pupils rated twice on this three-point scale, 281 (64%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 281 pupils, 161 (57%) gained one step and 14 (5%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 175 (62%) of the pupils achieved or exceeded the criterion compared to 52% who did so in the preceding year.

9) Child helps with simple household jobs

a) First Project Year - Of the 592 pupils rated on both administrations of the checklist, 276 (47%) were judged to be deficient on their initial rating. Of these 276 pupils, 131 (47%) gained one step and 2 (1%) gained two steps. In sum, 133 (48%) of the pupils judged to be deficient met the criterion of a one step gain in their final rating.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 440 rated at both times on this trait, 223 (51%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 223 pupils, 97 (43%) met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared with 48% who did so in the first year of project operation.

Language and Concept Development

1) Child speaks in sentences of five or more words

a) First Project Year - Of the 593 pupils rated upon entry into both the PCEE and kindergarten years, 50 (8%) were judged to be deficient in their first ratings of this skill. Of these 50 pupils, 40 (80%) gained one step and 1(2%) gained two steps in their second ratings. Altogether, 41 (82%) of the pupils rated as deficient in this trait met the criterion of a minimum of a one step gain on this three-point scale.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated two times, 22 (5%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 22 pupils, 20 (91%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings as compared with 82% who did so last year.

2) Child identifies six or more colors

a) First Project Year - Of the 588 pupils rated initially and finally on this scale, 172 (29%) were judged to be deficient in this skill. Of these 172 pupils, 101 (59%) gained one step and 58 (34%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 159 (92%) of those pupils judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 442 rated, both initially and finally, 140 (32%) were found to be deficient in this behavior on their first ratings. Of these 140 pupils, 80 (57%) gained one step and 40 (29%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 120 (86%) of the 140 pupils attained or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared to 92% who did so in the previous year. It should be noted that 57 of the pupils not rated deficient initially were rated as deficient in their second rating by parents.

3) Child recites rhymes, sings songs

a) First Project Year - Of the 589 pupils rated twice on this three-point scale, 257 (44%) were judged to be deficient in this behavior. Of these 257 pupils, 156 (61%) gained one step and five (2%) gained two steps. Altogether, 161 (63%) of those pupils judged initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 442 pupils rated twice, 203 pupils (46%) were judged to be initially deficient by their parents. Of these 203 pupils, 164 (81%) gained one step and 24 (12%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 188 (93%) of the 203 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared to 63% who did so last year.

4) Child tells how things are alike or different

a) First Project Year - Of the 589 pupils rated both times on this skill, 293 (50%) were judged to be deficient on the first rating. Of these 293 pupils, 179 (61%) gained one step and 16 (5%) gained two steps in their final ratings of this trait. In sum, 195 (67%) of the 293 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 200 (45%) were found to be initially deficient on this scale. Of these 200 pupils, 143 (72%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings. This compares with 67% who did so in the first year.

5) Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet

a) First Project Year - Of the 572 pupils rated on this skill twice, 287 (50%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 287 pupils, 166 (58%) gained one step and 69 (24%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 235 (82%) of the 287 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 197 (45%) were rated as initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 197 pupils, 141 (72%) gained one step and 32 (16%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 173 (88%) of the initially deficient pupils met or exceeded the criterion as compared to 82% who did so last year.

6) Child identifies many letters of the alphabet

a) First Project Year - Of the 580 pupils rated twice on this skill, 381 (66%) were found to be initially deficient. Of the 381 pupils, 142 (37%) gained one step and 115 (30%) gained two steps. In sum, 257 (67%) of those pupils judged to be deficient in this skill upon entry into the PCEE Program met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 440 pupils rated two times, 293 (67%) were judged to be initially deficient on this scale by their parents. Of these 293 pupils, 117 (40%) gained one step and 94 (32%) gained two steps. In total, 211 (72%) of the 293 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared to 67% who did so last year.

7) Child prints his first name correctly

a) First Project Year - Of the 589 pupils rated twice by their parents on this skill, 457 (78%) were found to be deficient at the time of entry into the PCEE Program. Of these 457 pupils, 169 (37%) gained one step and 221 (48%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 390 (85%) of the 457 pupils met or exceeded the criterion.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 325 (74%) were judged to be initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 325 pupils, 119 (37%) gained one step and 180 (55%) gained two steps on their final ratings. In total, 299 (92%) of the 325 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared with 85% of the pupils who did so in the first year.

8) Child tells his whole name

a) First Project Year - Of the 586 pupils rated both times on this scale, 138 (24%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 138 pupils, 94 (68%) gained one step and 35 (25%) gained two steps in their second ratings. Altogether, 129 (93%) of the 138 pupils met or exceeded the criterion.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 96 (22%) were judged by their parents to be initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 96 pupils, 89 (93%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step increase in their final ratings which is identical to that reported for first year pupils.

9) Child tells his address

a) First Project Year - Of the 586 pupils rated twice on this scale, 448 (76%) were judged as initially deficient. Of these 448 pupils, 214 (48%) gained one step and 113 (25%) gained two steps in their ratings received one year later. In total, 327 (73%) of the 448 pupils met or exceeded the criterion.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 334 (76%) were found to be initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 334 pupils, 149 (45%) gained one step and 82 (25%) gained two steps on their final ratings. Altogether, 231 (70%) of the 334 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared to 73% who did so in the previous year.

10) Child tells his telephone number

a) First Project Year - Of the 575 pupils rated twice on this scale, 521 (91%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 521 pupils, 141 (27%) gained one step and 167 (32%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In total, 308 (59%) of the 521 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain on this scale.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 440 pupils rated twice, 386 (88%) were judged to be initially deficient in this behavior. Of these 386 pupils, 105 (27%) gained one step and 111 (29%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 216 (56%) of the 386 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared to 59% who did so in the preceding year.

11) Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond

a) First Project Year - Of the 590 pupils rated on this scale two times by their parents, 144 (24%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 144 pupils, 78 (54%) gained one step and 46 (32%) gained two steps in their second ratings. In sum, 124 (86%) of the 144 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice, 110 (25%) were judged by their parents to be initially deficient in this trait. Of these 110 pupils, 78 (71%) gained one step and 30 (27%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 108 (98%) of the 110 pupils met or exceeded the criterion as compared with 86% who did so in the preceding year.

Motor Skill Development

1) Child can ride a tricycle or bicycle

a) First Project Year - Of the 590 pupils rated twice on this scale, 11 (2%) were rated as deficient initially. Of these 11 pupils, four (36%) gained one step and three (27%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In total, seven (64%) of the 11 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice on this scale, 18 (4%) were rated as deficient initially. Of these 18 pupils, 16 (89%) met the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings as compared to 64% who did so in the preceding year.

2) Child runs, hops, and jumps

a) First Project Year - Of the 591 pupils rated twice on this scale, 22 (4%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 22 pupils, 21 (95%) met the criterion of a one step gain in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice on this scale, 22 (5%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 22 pupils, 18 (82%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in final ratings as compared with 95% who did so in the preceding year.

3) Child claps or marches in time to music

a) First Project Year - Of the 589 pupils rated twice on this three-point scale, 214 (36%) were rated as initially deficient. Of these 214 pupils, 125 (58%) gained one step and 11 (5%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In total, 136 (64%) of the 214 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 441 pupils rated twice on this scale, 143 (32%) were judged to be deficient initially. Of these 143 pupils, 91 (64%) met or exceeded the criterion set for them. This is identical with the proportion of pupils who attained the goal in the previous year.

4) Child uses scissors with control

a) First Project Year - Of the 588 pupils rated twice on this scale, 384 (65%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 384 pupils, 228 (59%) gained one step and 42 (11%) gained two steps on their second ratings. Altogether, 270 (70%) of the 384 pupils met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 442 pupils rated twice on this behavior, 279 (63%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 279 pupils, 161 (58%) gained one step and 38 (14%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 199 (71%) of the 279 pupils met or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared with 70% who did so in the previous year.

Interests and Experiences

1) Child is read to

a) First Project Year - Of the 585 pupils rated both initially and finally, 247 (42%) were rated as being deficient initially. Of these 247 pupils, 73 (30%) gained one step and 6 (2%) gained two steps in their second ratings. In sum, 79 (32%) of the 247 pupils met the criterion of a one step change.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 437 pupils rated on this three point scale both upon entry into the PCEE Program and into kindergarten, 167 (38%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 167 pupils, 49 (29%) attained or exceeded the criterion set for them as compared with 32% who did so in the preceding year. It should be noted that 50 pupils who were not initially judged deficient became so in their final ratings.

2) Child goes to the library

a) First Project Year - Of the 587 pupils rated twice on this three-point scale, 357 (61%) were rated as deficient in this activity. Of these 357 pupils, 80 (22%) increased one step and 15 (4%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 95 (27%) of the 357 pupils met the criterion.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 438 pupils rated twice on this scale, 275 (63%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 275 pupils, 67 (24%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain in final ratings. This finding is comparable to that obtained for first year pupils where 27% of the pupils met the criterion. It should be noted that 82 pupils not initially deficient were found to be so on their final ratings.

3) Child watches Sesame Street

a) First Project Year - Of the 586 pupils rated both times, 271 (46%) were reported to watch the program less than "often." Of these 271 pupils, 118 (44%) changed one step and seven (3%) changed two steps in the direction of watching Sesame Street often. Altogether, 125 (46%) of the 271 pupils met the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 438 pupils rated twice on this scale, 189 (43%) were judged to be initially deficient. Of these 189 pupils, 102 (54%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain as compared to 46% who did so in the first year. On the other hand, 47 pupils judged to be not initially deficient became so in their final ratings.

4) Child takes trips outside the community

a) First Project Year - Of the 586 pupils rated twice on this three-point scale, 221 (38%) were rated as deficient on this activity. Of these 221 pupils, 79 (36%) met the criterion set for them of a one step gain in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 438 pupils rated twice on this scale, 177 (40%) were found to be initially deficient. Of these 177 pupils, 63 (36%) met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain which is identical to the proportion found to do so in the preceding year. At the same time, 80 pupils initially judged to be not deficient became so in their final ratings.

The results of the differences between parents' ratings of their children at the time of entry into the PCEE Program and at the time of entry into kindergarten were quite similar for the first two years of project operation. It was found that parents, in general, judged their children to have improved in almost all areas of development, but especially so in the area of Language and Concept Development.

This area is probably the one most stressed in the PCEE Program itself. From 56% to 98% of those pupils initially judged to be deficient met the criterion of a one step gain in both years of the project on the different items that make up this area of development. During the second project year, the proportion of pupils attaining the criterion reached upward from 70% on 10 of the 11 items.

It should be noted that the goal of 100% criterion attainment on the part of all pupils was not fully met. Yet, from the evidence given above, it would appear that the goal was successfully approximated in nearly all instances.

f. Product Objective Six

> Upon entrance into kindergarten, children who have participated in the PCEE Program will attain mean rating scores at least one-eighth of a standard deviation higher in parents' ratings of Personal and Social Development, Language and Concept Development, and Physical Skill Development, than will pupils of similar socio-economic status who had attended kindergarten in the previous year and who had not participated in the project or experienced other types of preschool programs.

In the comparisons made between first project year PCEE pupils upon entry into kindergarten (1972) and their controls from the preceding year (1971), different forms of "My Kindergarten Child" were used. This meant that only fifteen items relevant to this objective were common to both scales. By the time the comparisons between second year PCEE pupils and their controls were made, the same expanded form of the instrument was available for pupils entering kindergarten in 1972 and 1973. It was thus possible to compare PCEE and Control pupils on 47 items organized into the following areas: Personal and Social Development, Language and Concept Development, Motor Skill Development, and Interests and Experiences.

The results are organized below by project year.

Results of the First Project Year:

As stated above, the first year PCEE pupils could be compared to the control pupils who had entered kindergarten one year earlier on only 15 items. The vast majority of these 15 items were in the area of Personal and Social Development (ten) and there were few items measuring Language and Concept Development (five). There were no items tapping the areas of motor skill development or interests and experiences. Therefore, a second control group was used to provide a better basis for comparison with first project year PCEE pupils. This control group consisted of pupils entering kindergarten in 1972 (at the same time as first year PCEE pupils) who had no preschool experience of any kind. The results of both sets of comparisons are given in Table 7.

Table 7
A Summary of Results Comparing First Project Year (N=649) PCEE Pupils Upon Entry into Kindergarten in Fall, 1972 to Control Kindergarten Pupils Upon Entry into Kindergarten in a) Fall, 1971 (N=911) and b) Fall, 1972 (N=267) on Items of "Introducing My Kindergarten Child"

Item	Group*	Year	Mean**	Standard Deviation	F	p
Personal and Social Development						
1. Child dresses self: gloves	PCEE	1972	1.76	.47		
	Control	1971	1.80	.44	2.59	n.s.
	Control	1972	1.73	.50	<1	n.s.
2. Child dresses self: coat, jacket, or sweater	PCEE	1972	1.90	.32		
	Control	1971	1.91	.31	<1	n.s.
	Control	1972	1.82	.42	10.24	<.005
3. Child dresses self: Boots	PCEE	1972	1.59	.61		
	Control	1971	1.57	.63	<1	n.s.
	Control	1972	1.59	.62	<1	n.s.
4. Child buttons, snaps, and zips clothing	PCEE	1972	1.81	.40		
	Control	1972	1.74	.47	5.44	<.025
5. Child ties shoelaces or bows	PCEE	1972	1.17	.30		
	Control	1971	1.61	.51	149.35	<.005
	Control	1972	1.14	.90	<1	n.s.
6. Child goes to toilet by himself	PCEE	1972	1.97	.18		
	Control	1972	1.98	.17	<1	n.s.
7. Child takes good care of things he uses	PCEE	1972	1.61	.49		
	Control	1971	1.23	.46	242.65	<.005
	Control	1972	1.59	.52	<1	n.s.
8. Child pays attention & concentrates well	PCEE	1972	1.42	.52		
	Control	1972	1.42	.52	<1	n.s.
9. Child follows simple directions without reminding	PCEE	1972	1.51	.51		
	Control	1971	1.93	.28	429.77	<.005
	Control	1972	1.48	.53	<1	n.s.
10. Child tells what he wants or needs	PCEE	1972	1.91	.29		
	Control	1971	1.63	.51	162.27	<.005
	Control	1972	1.89	.33	<1	n.s.
11. Child takes turns and shares	PCEE	1972	1.60	.50		
	Control	1972	1.61	.50	<1	n.s.

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Group*	Year	Mean**	Standard Deviation	F	p
12. Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways	PCEE	1972	1.63	.51		
	Control	1972	1.64	.50	<1	n.s.
13. Child shows leadership in organizing games	PCEE	1972	1.16	.60		
	Control	1971	1.56	.53	185.91	<.005
	Control	1972	1.17	.62	<1	n.s.
14. Child remembers rules of games he plays	PCEE	1972	1.55	.54		
	Control	1971	1.27	.73	62.24	<.005
	Control	1972	1.45	.60	6.25	<.025
15. Child finishes a game even if he is losing	PCEE	1972	1.39	.58		
	Control	1971	1.94	.28	621.54	<.005
	Control	1972	1.39	.60	<1	n.s.
16. Child helps with simple household jobs	PCEE	1972	1.55	.52		
	Control	1972	1.53	.52	<1	n.s.
17. Child finishes a task	PCEE	1972	1.45	.53		
	Control	1972	1.44	.53	<1	n.s.
Language and Concept Development						
1. Child speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	PCEE	1972	1.96	.20		
	Control	1972	1.97	.22	<1	n.s.
2. Child recites rhymes, sings songs	PCEE	1972	1.70	.50		
	Control	1971	1.94	.29	137.95	<.005
	Control	1972	1.59	.56	8.84	<.005
3. Child identifies 6 or more colors	PCEE	1972	1.93	.29		
	Control	1972	1.80	.50	25.00	<.005
4. Child tells events of a story or experience	PCEE	1972	1.82	.41		
	Control	1972	1.78	.46	1.66	n.s.
5. Child tells his whole name	PCEE	1972	1.95	.24		
	Control	1972	1.88	.40	10.12	<.005
6. Child tells address	PCEE	1972	1.46	.72		
	Control	1971	1.80	.44	135.61	<.005
	Control	1972	1.33	.78	6.02	<.025

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Group*	Year	Mean**	Standard Deviation	F	p
7. Child tells telephone number	PCEE	1972	1.10	.89		
	Control	1971	1.84	.40	490.77	<.005
	Control	1972	.96	.91	4.64	<.05
8. Child tells how things are alike or different	PCEE	1972	1.73	.46		
	Control	1972	1.65	.55	5.22	<.025
9. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	PCEE	1972	1.79	.48		
	Control	1971	1.31	.82	175.10	<.005
	Control	1972	1.64	.62	15.58	<.005
10. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	PCEE	1972	1.44	.81		
	Control	1971	.97	.90	111.09	<.005
	Control	1972	1.19	.90	16.80	<.005
11. Child reads simple sentences	PCEE	1972	.23	.56		
	Control	1972	.09	.31	15.12	<.005
12. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	PCEE	1972	1.93	.30		
	Control	1972	1.89	.38	3.02	n.s.
13. Child recognizes numerals 0 to 10	PCEE	1972	1.75	.53		
	Control	1972	1.44	.74	51.97	<.005
14. Child groups objects into sets of 0 to 10	PCEE	1972	1.62	.59		
	Control	1972	1.34	.78	35.49	<.005
Motor Skill Development						
1. Child runs, hops, and jumps	PCEE	1972	1.98	.16		
	Control	1972	1.96	.21	<1	n.s.
2. Child can ride tricycle or bicycle	PCEE	1972	1.97	.21		
	Control	1972	1.98	.17	<1	n.s.
3. Child aims and catches a ball	PCEE	1972	1.65	.51		
	Control	1972	1.62	.52	<1	n.s.
4. Child claps or marches in time with music	PCEE	1972	1.75	.47		
	Control	1972	1.70	.55	1.93	n.s.
5. Child skips	PCEE	1972	1.57	.70		
	Control	1972	1.57	.70	<1	n.s.
6. Child works a puzzle of 12 or more pieces	PCEE	1972	1.70	.51		
	Control	1972	1.51	.66	22.56	<.005

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Group*	Year	Mean**	Standard Deviation	F	p
7. Child used paints & crayons with control	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.73 1.68	.48 .52	2.04	n.s.
8. Child uses scissors with control	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.64 1.53	.53 .65	7020	<.01
9. Child includes major body parts & features in drawing a person	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.61 1.38	.59 .73	25.00	<.005
10. Child prints his first name correctly	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.63 1.28	.64 .80	49.28	<.005
11. Child prints his whole name correctly	PCEE Control	1972 1972	.79 .58	.84 .76	12.67	<.005
Interests and Experiences						
1. Child is read to	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.56 1.43	.52 .53	11.70	<.005
2. Child enjoys music	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.78 1.77	.43 .45	<1	n.s.
3. Child goes to the library	PCEE Control	1972 1972	.99 .70	.74 .74	28.84	<.005
4. Child watches "Sesame Street"	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.52 1.44	.59 .67	3.31	n.s.
5. Child goes shopping, visits interesting people and places in the community	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.59 1.45	.52 .60	12.89	<.005
6. Child takes trips outside the community	PCEE Control	1972 1972	1.54 1.44	.55 .59	6.25	<.025

*The 1971 Control Group was rated on only 15 items similar to the 1972 PCEE group.

**Each three-point scale was scored as follows: 0 = Not at all, 1 = once in a while, and, 2 = often

It can be seen in Table 7 that PCEE pupils exceeded the control group from the preceding year on three of the 10 items in the Personal and Social Development area and on two of the five items in the Language and Concept Development area. On all five items favoring the PCEE pupils, the criterion of a one-eighth standard deviation difference between means was met, and, in fact, exceeded.

In the comparisons made between PCEE pupils and control pupils from the same year, it can be seen that there were three statistically significant differences on the 17 items in the area of Personal and Social Development, 11 statistically significant differences on the 14 items in the area of Language and Concept Development, five statistically significant differences on the 11 items in the Motor Skills Development area, and four statistically significant differences on the six items in the Interests and Experiences area. All of the 32 statistically significant differences favored the PCEE pupils over their controls. Moreover, all of the 32 differences exceeded the criterion set of a one-eighth standard deviation difference between means.

In general, the PCEE pupils were rated as having greater language and concept development as well as higher motor skill development by their parents than were control pupils who entered kindergarten at the same time. In addition, PCEE pupils were read to more, taken to the library more, as well as taken on trips inside and out of the community more often than pupils in this control group.

Results of the Second Project Year

Second project year PCEE pupils were compared to two control groups on the 47 items of the instrument "My Kindergarten Child." The first control group consisted of pupils who entered kindergarten one year prior to the PCEE pupils (the same pupils, in fact, who provided the second control group for the first year PCEE pupils). The second control group consisted of pupils who entered kindergarten at the same time as did second project year PCEE pupils. None of the pupils in either control group had experienced any kind of preschool. The results of comparing second project year PCEE pupils to both control groups are given in Table 8.

Table 8
A Summary of Results Comparing Second Project Year PCEE Pupils (N=519) Upon Entry Into Kindergarten in Fall, 1973 to Control Kindergarten Pupils Upon Entry Into Kindergarten in a) Fall, 1972 (N=267) and b) Fall, 1973 (N=152) on items of "Introducing My Kindergarten Child"

Item	Group	Year	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
Personal and Social Development						
1. Child dresses self: gloves	PCEE	1973	1.75	.47		
	Control	1972	1.73	.50	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.65	.58	4.73	<.05
2. Child dresses self: coat, jacket, or sweater	PCEE	1973	1.86	.38		
	Control	1972	1.82	.42	1.90	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.82	.38	1.31	n.s.
3. Child dresses self: boots	PCEE	1973	1.54	.64		
	Control	1972	1.59	.62	1.13	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.53	.62	<1	n.s.
4. Child buttons, snaps, and zips clothing	PCEE	1973	1.81	.42		
	Control	1972	1.74	.47	4.50	<.05
	Control	1973	1.76	.47	1.56	n.s.
5. Child ties shoelaces or bows	PCEE	1973	1.11	.91		
	Control	1972	1.14	.90	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.01	.95	1.38	n.s.
6. Child goes to toilet by himself	PCEE	1973	1.97	.17		
	Control	1972	1.98	.17	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.99	.08	1.78	n.s.
7. Child takes good care of things he uses	PCEE	1973	1.63	.49		
	Control	1972	1.59	.52	1.17	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.53	.53	4.73	<.05
8. Child pays attention and concentrates well	PCEE	1973	1.47	.52		
	Control	1972	1.42	.52	1.64	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.41	.49	1.63	n.s.
9. Child follows simple directions without reminding	PCEE	1973	1.52	.51		
	Control	1972	1.48	.53	1.05	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.47	.51	1.13	n.s.
10. Child tells what he wants or needs	PCEE	1973	1.93	.26		
	Control	1972	1.89	.33	3.31	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.88	.35	3.70	n.s.

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Group	Year	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
11. Child takes turns and shares	PCEE	1973	1.62	.49		
	Control	1972	1.61	.50	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.64	.50	<1	n.s.
12. Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways	PCEE	1973	1.67	.48		
	Control	1972	1.64	.50	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.62	.50	1.23	n.s.
13. Child shows leadership in organizing games	PCEE	1973	1.22	.62		
	Control	1972	1.17	.50	1.18	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.24	.64	<1	n.s.
14. Child remembers rules of games he plays	PCEE	1973	1.62	.50		
	Control	1972	1.45	.60	18.06	<.005
	Control	1973	1.44	.61	13.49	<.005
15. Child finishes a game even if he is losing	PCEE	1973	1.46	.55		
	Control	1972	1.39	.60	2.78	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.33	.62	6.25	<.025
16. Child helps with simple household jobs	PCEE	1973	1.57	.52		
	Control	1972	1.53	.52	1.05	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.52	.58	1.04	n.s.
17. Child finishes a task	PCEE	1973	1.46	.52		
	Control	1972	1.44	.53	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.37	.55	3.37	n.s.
Language and Concept Development						
1. Child speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	PCEE	1973	1.98	.14		
	Control	1972	1.97	.22	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.98	.14	<1	n.s.
2. Child recites rhymes, sings songs	PCEE	1973	1.76	.46		
	Control	1972	1.59	.56	21.11	<.005
	Control	1973	1.66	.53	5.17	<.025
3. Child identifies 6 or more colors	PCEE	1973	1.94	.29		
	Control	1972	1.80	.50	25.00	<.005
	Control	1973	1.77	.55	26.54	<.005
4. Child tells events of a story or experience	PCEE	1973	1.81	.42		
	Control	1972	1.78	.46	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.78	.47	<1	n.s.

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Group	Year	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
5. Child tells his whole name	PCEE	1973	1.95	.22		
	Control	1972	1.88	.40	10.12	<.005
	Control	1973	1.86	.43	11.98	<.005
6. Child tells his address	PCEE	1973	1.37	.76		
	Control	1972	1.33	.78	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.14	.88	9.93	<.005
7. Child tells his telephone number	PCEE	1973	1.09	.90		
	Control	1972	.96	.91	3.65	n.s.
	Control	1973	.77	.86	15.23	<.005
8. Child tells how things are alike or different	PCEE	1973	1.77	.43		
	Control	1972	1.65	.55	11.76	<.005
	Control	1973	1.62	.59	12.17	<.005
9. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	PCEE	1973	1.84	.41		
	Control	1972	1.64	.62	29.22	<.005
	Control	1973	1.60	.66	29.75	<.005
10. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	PCEE	1973	1.54	.75		
	Control	1972	1.19	.90	34.03	<.005
	Control	1973	1.14	.90	30.02	<.005
11. Child reads simple sentences	PCEE	1973	.26	.61		
	Control	1972	.09	.31	18.06	<.005
	Control	1973	.10	.36	9.47	<.005
12. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	PCEE	1973	1.98	.17		
	Control	1972	1.89	.38	22.43	<.005
	Control	1973	1.89	.42	15.31	<.005
13. Child recognizes numerals from 0 to 10	PCEE	1973	1.81	.44		
	Control	1972	1.44	.74	77.61	<.005
	Control	1973	1.47	.76	48.15	<.005
14. Child groups objects into sets of 0 to 10	PCEE	1973	1.69	.55		
	Control	1972	1.34	.78	53.17	<.005
	Control	1973	1.20	.84	71.37	<.005
Motor Skill Development						
1. Child runs, hops, jumps	PCEE	1973	1.98	.13		
	Control	1972	1.96	.21	2.78	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.97	.16	<1	n.s.

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Group	Year	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	P
2. Child can ride tricycle or bicycle	PCEE	1973	1.98	.19		
	Control	1972	1.98	.17	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.99	.11	<1	n.s.
3. Child aims and catches a ball	PCEE	1973	1.67	.48		
	Control	1972	1.62	.52	1.83	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.59	.56	3.02	<.05
4. Child claps or marches in time to music	PCEE	1973	1.76	.46		
	Control	1972	1.70	.55	2.63	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.67	.55	4.18	<.05
5. Child skips	PCEE	1973	1.60	.67		
	Control	1972	1.57	.70	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.53	.72	1.23	n.s.
6. Child works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	PCEE	1973	1.70	.55		
	Control	1972	1.51	.66	18.65	<.005
	Control	1973	1.47	.68	18.14	<.005
7. Child uses crayons and paint with control	PCEE	1973	1.78	.44		
	Control	1972	1.68	.52	8.16	<.01
	Control	1973	1.63	.57	12.17	<.005
8. Child uses scissors with control	PCEE	1973	1.65	.53		
	Control	1972	1.53	.65	7.79	<.01
	Control	1973	1.43	.72	17.23	<.005
9. Child includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	PCEE	1973	1.64	.58		
	Control	1972	1.38	.73	29.34	<.005
	Control	1973	1.36	.77	23.31	<.005
10. Child prints first name correctly	PCEE	1973	1.73	.52		
	Control	1972	1.28	.80	91.67	<.005
	Control	1973	1.25	.84	73.47	<.005
11. Child prints whole name correctly	PCEE	1973	.89	.83		
	Control	1972	.58	.76	25.83	<.005
	Control	1973	.54	.79	21.21	<.005

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Group	Year	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
Interests and Experiences						
1. Child is read to	PCEE	1973	1.57	.52		
	Control	1972	1.43	.53	12.89	<.005
	Control	1973	1.34	.50	22.96	<.005
2. Child enjoys music	PCEE	1973	1.79	.42		
	Control	1972	1.77	.45	<1	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.81	.41	<1	n.s.
3. Child goes to the library	PCEE	1973	.97	.74		
	Control	1972	.70	.74	23.25	<.005
	Control	1973	.49	.65	51.33	<.005
4. Child watches "Sesame Street"	PCEE	1973	1.61	.56		
	Control	1972	1.44	.67	14.27	<.005
	Control	1973	1.56	.63	<1	n.s.
5. Child goes shopping, visits interesting people and places in the community	PCEE	1973	1.57	.54		
	Control	1972	1.45	.60	8.16	<.01
	Control	1973	1.40	.62	11.11	<.005
6. Child takes trips outside the community	PCEE	1973	1.51	.55		
	Control	1972	1.44	.59	2.78	n.s.
	Control	1973	1.42	.58	3.11	n.s.

*Each three-point scale was scored as follows: 0 = Not at all; 1 = once in a while; and 2 = often

It can be seen in Table 8 that PCEE pupils exceeded the control group from the preceding year on two of the 17 items in the area of Personal and Social Development, on 10 of the 14 items in the area of Language and Concept Development, on six of the 11 items in the area of Motor Skill Development, and on four of the six items in the area of Interests and Experiences. On all 22 of the items that differentiated in a statistically significant manner between second year PCEE pupils and the control group from the previous year, the criterion of an one-eighth standard deviation difference between means was exceeded. It should be noted that on no item did the control group score statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group.

When PCEE pupils were compared to control group pupils entering kindergarten during the same year, it was found that the PCEE group exceeded their controls on three of the 17 items in the Personal and Social Development area, on 12 of the 14 items in the area of Language and Concept Development, on eight of the 11 items in the area of Motor Skill Development, and on three of the six items in the area of Interests and Experiences. On all 26 of the items on which the PCEE pupils scored significantly higher than did the control group from the same year, the criterion of an one-eighth standard deviation difference between means was exceeded. Again, it should be noted, on no item did the control group score statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group.

In general, PCEE pupils were rated as having greater language and concept development as well as higher motor skill development by their parents than were control pupils who either entered kindergarten in the previous year or at the same time as did the PCEE pupils.

Looking at the results obtained for both the first and second project year PCEE pupils on the full, revised 47 item scale, it seems safe to say that the PCEE Program has had its greatest impact on the area of Language and Concept Development where, on the average, 79% of the items favored the PCEE pupils over their controls. The program has also apparently had a considerable impact on the area of Motor Skill Development where, on the average, 58% of the items favored PCEE pupils over their controls.

g. Product Objective Seven

> Upon entrance into kindergarten, children who have participated in the PCEE Program will attain scores at least one-eighth of a standard deviation higher in each of the eight academic readiness areas listed below than will pupils of similar socio-economic status who had attended kindergarten in the previous year and who had not participated in the project or experienced other types of preschool programs. a) Picture Vocabulary b) Letters c) Picture Completion d) Copying Designs e) Picture Description f) Human Figure Drawing g) Relationships h) Numbers i) Total Score

All first and second year PCEE pupils who entered kindergarten were tested using the Screening Test of Academic Readiness (STAR) in the fall of their kindergarten year. The PCEE pupils were then compared to control groups which consisted of pupils who had entered kindergarten in the district during the preceding year and had experienced no preschool of any kind. A summary of these comparisons is presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary of Results Comparing PCEE Pupils Upon Entry Into Kindergarten to Control Group Pupils Entering Kindergarten One Year Earlier on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness

STAR	Project Year	Group	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
Picture Vocabulary	First	PCEE	681	9.12	2.12	6.43	<.025
		Control	911	9.43	2.24		
	Second	PCEE	602	10.12	2.04	58.68	<.005
		Control	302	8.94	2.43		
Letters	First	PCEE	681	6.42	2.49	33.12	<.005
		Control	911	5.61	2.88		
	Second	PCEE	602	6.56	2.41	64.00	<.005
		Control	302	5.08	2.99		
Picture Completion	First	PCEE	681	4.57	1.67	1.34	n.s.
		Control	911	4.48	1.60		
	Second	PCEE	602	4.73	1.52	15.68	<.005
		Control	302	4.29	1.67		
Copying	First	PCEE	681	2.92	1.34	1.34	n.s.
		Control	911	3.00	1.31		
	Second	PCEE	602	3.19	1.16	21.62	<.005
		Control	302	2.79	1.32		
Picture Description	First	PCEE	681	6.18	1.76	16.06	<.005
		Control	911	5.82	1.81		
	Second	PCEE	602	6.30	1.76	40.70	<.005
		Control	302	5.49	1.79		
Human Figure Drawing	First	PCEE	681	9.81	3.13	2.84	n.s.
		Control	911	9.53	3.32		
	Second	PCEE	602	10.27	3.31	52.56	<.005
		Control	302	8.53	3.44		
Relationships	First	PCEE	681	6.73	1.39	19.45	<.005
		Control	911	6.40	1.57		
	Second	PCEE	602	6.85	1.29	16.97	<.005
		Control	302	6.26	1.54		

(Continued)

Table 9 (continued)

STAR	Project Year	Group	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
Numbers	First	PCEE	681	8.69	3.71	13.56	<.005
		Control	911	7.95	4.11		
	Second	PCEE	602	9.32	3.61	72.42	<.005
		Control	302	7.04	4.12		
Total	First	PCEE	681	54.98	11.40	19.00	<.005
		Control	911	52.26	12.93		
	Second	PCEE	602	57.22	10.89	112.36	<.005
		Control	302	48.23	13.68		

*Scores are expressed in raw score units.

It may be seen in Table 9 that pupils who had participated in the PCEE Program during the first project year had higher mean scores on five of the eight subtests of the STAR as well as on the total scores as compared to their controls. Pupils who participated in the PCEE Program during its second year of operation were found to exceed their controls on all eight of the subtests as well as on the total scores.

The criterion to be met for this objective specified that in addition to statistically significant results there would be at least an eighth of a standard deviation difference between the means of the PCEE and Control groups. This criterion was met in all instances where statistically significant results were obtained. It was not met in the three instances where non significant results were obtained.

In summary, pupils who participated in the first PCEE project year tended to score higher in such areas of cognitive attainment as Picture Vocabulary, Letters, Picture Description, Relationships, and Numbers than did comparable pupils who had not participated in any preschool program. Pupils who participated in the second PCEE project year tended to score higher in all areas of academic readiness than did comparable pupils from the preceding year.

Additional Comparisons

1) In following up the second year PCEE pupils upon their entry into kindergarten, additional analyses were made comparing those PCEE pupils who had been identified as belonging to the primary target group with a) PCEE pupils who were identified as not being handicapped and b) Control group pupils who had no preschool experience of any kind and who, as a group, did not have learning problems on the STAR in the fall, 1973. The results of these comparisons are presented in Table 10-1.

Table 10-1

Results of Comparisons Between PCEE Pupils Identified as Handicapped (N = 255); PCEE Pupils Not Identified as Handicapped (N = 347); and Pupils With No Preschool Experience of any Kind (N = 184) at the Time of Entry into Kindergarten in Fall, 1973 on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness

Variable	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	F
STAR I Picture Vocabulary	PCEE - NH	10.40	1.95	14.54 <.005
	PCEE - H	9.75	2.11	5.67 <.025
	Control	9.24	2.39	
II Letters	PCEE - NH	6.82	2.34	8.95 <.005
	PCEE - H	6.22	2.47	35.10 <.005
	Control	4.75	2.69	
III Picture Completion	PCEE - NH	4.89	1.44	8.93 <.005
	PCEE - H	4.51	1.61	9.09 <.005
	Control	4.03	1.78	
IV Copying	PCEE - NH	3.28	1.09	4.49 <.05
	PCEE - H	3.07	1.25	3.43 n.s.
	Control	2.84	1.36	
V Picture Description	PCEE - NH	6.57	1.70	19.57 <.005
	PCEE - H	5.93	1.77	7.21 <.01
	Control	5.48	1.72	
VI Human Figure Drawing	PCEE - NH	10.49	3.17	3.68 n.s.
	PCEE - H	9.96	3.47	21.25 <.005
	Control	8.44	3.34	
VII Relationships	PCEE - NH	7.02	1.17	14.99 <.005
	PCEE - H	6.62	1.41	10.18 <.005
	Control	6.15	1.66	
VIII Numbers	PCEE - NH	9.84	3.37	17.41 <.005
	PCEE - H	8.61	3.82	28.83 <.005
	Control	6.62	3.84	
TOTAL	PCEE - NH	59.12	9.73	25.95 <.005
	PCEE - H	54.64	11.83	34.89 <.005
	Control	47.64	12.83	

It may be seen that non-handicapped PCEE pupils attained higher average scores on all subtests but one (Human Figure Drawing) as well as on the total test when compared to the handicapped PCEE pupils. However, the handicapped PCEE pupils had higher average scores on every subtest but one (Copying) as well as on the total test when compared with the control group. Apparently, it was not possible for the primary target group to catch up completely with non-handicapped pupils who had participated in the PCEE Program but, given the experience in the program, they far exceeded non-handicapped pupils with no preschool experience.

2) All first and second project year PCEE pupils were compared using the STAR, upon entry into kindergarten, with pupils who had experienced other kinds of preschool and with control pupils who had had no preschool experience of any kind all of whom entered kindergarten in the district during the same year as the PCEE group. The results of these comparisons are given in Table 10-2.

Table 10-2

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarteners in 1972 and 1973 on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness

Variable	Project Year	Group*	N	Mean and Duncan's Results	Standard Deviation	F	p
STAR							
I Picture Vocabulary	First	PCEE	681	9.72	2.13	13.63	<.005
		P-S	200	9.78 b,d	2.46		
		Control	302	8.94	2.43		
	Second	PCEE	602	10.12	2.04	13.90	<.005
		P-S	182	10.23 b,d	2.04		
		Control	184	9.24	2.39		
II Letters	First	PCEE	681	6.41	2.49	27.87	<.005
		P-S	200	6.34 b,d	2.56		
		Control	302	5.08	2.99		
	Second	PCEE	602	6.56	2.41	40.52	<.005
		P-S	182	6.68 b,d	2.54		
		Control	184	4.76	2.69		
III Picture Completion	First	PCEE	681	4.57	1.60	3.69	<.05
		P-S	200	4.61 b,d	1.68		
		Control	302	4.29	1.67		
	Second	PCEE	602	4.73	1.52	14.61	<.005
		P-S	182	4.79 b,d	1.78		
		Control	184	4.03	1.78		
IV Copying	First	PCEE	681	2.91	1.34	1.85	n.s.
		P-S	200	3.02	1.44		
		Control	302	2.79	1.32		
	Second	PCEE	602	3.19	1.16	5.64	<.025
		P-S	182	3.19 b,d	1.50		
		Control	184	2.84	1.36		
V Picture Description	First	PCEE	681	6.18	1.76	16.34	<.005
		P-S	200	5.83 b,d	1.87		
		Control	302	5.49	1.79		
	Second	PCEE	602	6.30	1.76	15.35	<.005
		P-S	182	6.19 b,d	1.83		
		Control	184	5.48	1.72		

Table 10-2 (continued)

Variable	Project Year	Group*	N	Mean and Duncan's Results	Standard Deviation	F	p
VI Human Figure Drawing		PCEE	681	9.81	3.13		
	First	P-S	200	9.22 a,b,d	3.42	16.29	<.005
		Control	302	8.53	3.44		
		PCEE	602	10.27	3.31		
	Second	P-S	182	9.71 a,b,d	3.26	21.60	<.005
		Control	184	8.44	3.34		
VII Relationships		PCEE	681	6.73	1.39		
	First	P-S	200	6.48 a,b	1.72	10.89	<.005
		Control	302	6.26	1.54		
		PCEE	602	6.85	1.29		
	Second	P-S	182	6.67 b,d	1.84	15.92	<.005
		Control	184	6.15	1.66		
VIII Numbers		PCEE	681	8.69	3.71		
	First	P-S	200	8.78 b,d	4.05	20.78	<.005
		Control	302	7.04	4.12		
		PCEE	602	9.32	3.61		
	Second	P-S	182	9.54 b,d	3.85	41.26	<.005
		Control	184	6.62	3.84		
Total		PCEE	681	54.98	11.40		
	First	P-S	200	53.97 a,b,d	13.49	31.68	<.005
		Control	302	48.23	13.68		
		PCEE	602	57.22	10.89		
	Second	P-S	182	56.48 b,d	12.90	48.73	<.005
		Control	184	47.64	12.83		

*** Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given using the following codes:**

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

It can be seen that PCEE pupils from the first project year exceeded control pupils on all subtests but one (Copying) as well as on Total scores while second year PCEE pupils scored higher, on the average, than their control comparison group on every subtest as well as on the Total test. Both groups of pupils who had preschool experience other than that provided by the PCEE Program scored higher than the control groups on all subtests but one (Relationships, for the second year only). In addition, PCEE pupils from both years scored higher than the preschool groups on the Human Figure Drawing Test while PCEE pupils from the first project year exceeded the preschool group on the Relationships subtest and on the Total battery.

In summary, pupils with preschool experience, whether from the PCEE Program or other sources, tended to score higher than pupils with no preschool experience of any kind who entered kindergarten during the same year. In four instances, PCEE pupils exceeded the average scores obtained by pupils with other kinds of preschool experience.

3) Local percentile norms were calculated using all pupils entering kindergarten in 1970 to aid

teachers in the district in interpreting test scores. Means, standard deviations, estimates of internal consistency reliability, and standard errors of measurement were calculated for each subtest as well as the Total battery. This information may be found in Appendix H-1.

h. Product Objective Eight

> Pupils who have participated in the PCEE Program will, upon entrance into first grade, score at least one sixth of a standard deviation higher on all subtests of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Primary Level II than pupils who have had no preschool experience of any kind and who enter first grade at the same time.

Pupils who had participated in the PCEE Program during the first year of project operation were compared to pupils who had had no preschool experience of any kind (the Control group) on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Primary Level II (SESAT, II) administered to all first graders in the fall, 1973. During the immediately preceding years, the Level I form of the SESAT had been administered to all first grade pupils as part of the district's regular testing program. It was noted that pupils' scores were extremely high and that the subtest apparently did not provide sufficient ceiling to measure reliable differences between groups. For these reasons, the decision was made to substitute the Level II form of the SESAT. This decision dictated a change in the originally planned comparisons between PCEE pupils and control pupils who would have entered first grade in the immediately preceding year. Instead, pupils with no preschool experience of any kind who entered the first grade at the same time as first project year PCEE pupils were used as the control group.

The SESAT, Level II battery contains six subtests including two that deal with reading. All first grade children were administered the first four subtests while only pupils who had acquired some reading skills were given the entire test.

The results of the comparisons between PCEE and control groups are given in Table 11 below.

Table 11

Summary of Results Comparing PCEE Pupils Upon Entry Into First Grade to Control Group Pupils Entering First Grade at the Same Time on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II

SESAT, II	Group	N*	Mean**	Standard Deviation	F	p
Environment	PCEE	482	27.20	4.37	20.88	<.005
	Control	267	25.60	4.86		
Math	PCEE	482	38.83	9.28	22.09	<.005
	Control	267	35.40	9.92		
Letters and Sounds	PCEE	482	35.44	5.43	14.06	<.005
	Control	267	33.79	6.47		
Aural Comprehension	PCEE	482	19.00	3.32	19.54	<.005
	Control	267	17.85	3.72		
Word Reading	PCEE	389	40.99	11.54	6.00	<.025
	Control	202	37.12	11.97		
Sentence Reading	PCEE	307	17.99	10.07	14.36	<.005
	Control	156	15.69	8.58		
Total of First Four Subtests	PCEE	482	120.32	18.50	26.73	<.005
	Control	267	112.67	20.80		

*Only those pupils who had acquired some reading skills took the last two subtests.

**Scores are represented in raw score units.

Statistically significant differences were found between the groups on all six subtests as well as on the Total scores generated by summing the first four subtests. The criterion of a one-sixth standard deviation difference between means was exceeded in all instances. Specifically, it was found that PCEE pupils scored higher, on the average, in the areas of Environment, Math, Letters and Sounds, Aural Comprehension, Word and Sentence Reading, and Total overall achievement based on the first four areas than did pupils who had not experienced preschool. The criterion set for this objective was fully met.

Additional Comparisons

1) PCEE pupils who had been identified as belonging to the primary target group (handicapped) were compared on the SESAT, II to a) PCEE pupils identified as not being handicapped and b) control group pupils who had no preschool experience of any kind. The results of these comparisons may be found in Table 12-1.

Table 12-1

Results of Comparisons Between PCEE Pupils Identified as Handicapped, PCEE Pupils Not Identified as Handicapped, and Pupils With No Preschool Experience of Any Kind at the Time of Entry Into First Grade in Fall, 1973 on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II

SESAT, II	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F
I Environment	PCEE - NH	239	27.62	4.21	4.45 <.05
	PCEE - H	243	26.78	4.49	8.14 <.005
	Control	267	25.60	4.86	
II Math	PCEE - NH	239	40.33	8.87	12.82 <.005
	PCEE - H	243	37.35	9.44	5.12 <.025
	Control	267	35.40	9.92	
III Letters & Sounds	PCEE - NH	239	36.49	4.87	18.59 <.005
	PCEE - H	243	34.40	5.75	1.23 n.s.
	Control	267	33.79	6.47	
IV Aural Comprehension	PCEE - NH	239	19.38	3.27	6.44 <.025
	PCEE - H	243	18.62	3.34	5.96 <.025
	Control	267	17.85	3.72	
V Word Reading	PCEE - NH	203	42.66	10.84	9.02 <.005
	PCEE - H	186	39.17	12.03	2.83 n.s.
	Control	202	37.11	11.97	
VI Sentence Reading	PCEE - NH	158	19.35	10.29	6.05 <.025
	PCEE - H	149	16.55	9.65	<1 n.s.
	Control	156	15.69	8.58	
Total of First Four Subtests	PCEE - NH	239	123.55	18.14	14.94 <.005
	PCEE - H	243	117.13	18.33	6.56 <.025
	Control	267	112.67	20.80	

It can be seen that PCEE pupils identified as not being handicapped scored higher, on the average, than PCEE target group pupils on all six subtests as well as on the Total scores. When the primary target group was compared to the control group, however, it was found that the handicapped PCEE pupils scored higher, on the average, on three of the first four subtests of the SESAT, II as well as on the Total scores. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups on the Letters and Sounds, Word Reading, or Sentence Reading subtests. Thus, in no case did control group pupils exceed primary target group pupils in any area of academic achievement as measured by the SESAT, II. Apparently, first year primary target group pupils did not equal their non-handicapped counterparts who participated in the PCEE Program but they do exceed, in the majority of instances, non-handicapped pupils who had no preschool experience in the area of academic achievement.

2) All first project year PCEE pupils were compared on the SESAT, II, upon entry into first grade with pupils who had other kinds of preschool experience as well as with control pupils who had had no preschool experience of any kind, all of whom entered first grade in the fall, 1973. The results of these comparisons are given in Table 12-2.

Table 12-2

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering First Grade Pupils (1973) on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II

SESAT II	F	Group[1]	N	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
I Environment		PCEE	482	27.20	4.37
	11.41 $< .005$	P-S	192	27.18 b, d	4.90
		Control	267	25.60	4.86
II Math		PCEE	482	38.83	9.28
	13.10 $< .005$	P-S	192	39.10 b, d	9.44
		Control	267	35.40	9.92
III Letters & Sounds		PCEE	482	35.44	5.43
	7.12 $< .01$	P-S	192	35.24 b, d	5.95
		Control	267	33.79	6.47
IV Aural Comprehension		PCEE	482	19.00	3.32
	11.27 $< .005$	P-S	192	19.14 b, d	3.45
		Control	267	17.85	3.72
V Word Reading		PCEE	389	40.99	11.54
	7.42 $< .01$	P-S	163	39.06 b	11.84
		Control	202	37.12	11.97
VI Sentence Reading		PCEE	307	17.99	10.07
	3.11 n.s.	P-S	130	16.69	9.80
		Control	156	15.69	8.58
Total of First Four Subtests		PCEE	482	120.32	18.50
	15.19 $< .005$	P-S	192	120.66 b, d	19.85
		Control	267	112.67	20.80

[1] Entering first graders were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the first project year; P-S = pupils with other preschool experience; and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind.

(Continued)

Table 12-2 (Continued)

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given in the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

It may be seen that both PCEE pupils and pupils with other kinds of preschool experience had higher average scores than did control group pupils on the first four subtests as well as on the Total scores. Only the PCEE group scored higher than the control on the Word Reading Subtest and no statistically significant differences were obtained on the Sentence Reading Subtest. There were also no statistically significant differences found between the PCEE and Pre-School groups on any area of academic achievement as measured by the SESAT, II.

3) Local norms were developed for use by the district's teachers in interpreting first graders' scores on the SESAT, Level II. These may be found in Appendices H-2a and H-2b. A comparison between the norms obtained by all first graders in the district and the

national norms supplied by the test's publishers shows wide discrepancies between the two groups. For example, on the Letters and Sounds Subtest the median score for the district's pupils was 36 whereas the median for the national sample was 30. On the Math Subtest the district median was 38; the national sample median was 31. The other differences on subtests were not as large as those described above except for Word Reading. However, all differences favored the local sample of first graders over the national norming sample.

i. Process Objective One

> The Project Director, Evaluator, and Specialists in the areas of the handicapped will develop a behavior checklist to be used by parents to rate children on three-point scales on Personal and Social Development, Language and Concept Development, Physical Skill Development, Interests, Experiences and other items designed to identify learning problems due to emotional disturbance (e.g. items from the Glidewell list), learning disabilities, experiential deprivation, physical handicaps, low intellectual functioning, and mental retardation.

The Behavior Checklist, "My Preschool Child," was developed using three-point scales instead of the five-point scales planned for ease of parent response. As part of the evaluation of this objective, an examination of the variability of ratings made by parents filling out the instrument in fall, 1971 was made. The items of the checklist, together with the means and standard deviations obtained by the total sample of PCEE pupils, is given in Table 13. For the proportions of responses to each point on the items, refer to Appendix D-1.

Inspection of Table 13 clearly indicates that the responses to the items of the checklist were, for the most part, highly variable. If an arbitrary cut-off point of .5 is set (one-sixth of the three-point range), it may be seen that all but 12 of the 65 items exceed this level. One may safely conclude that, in general, this instrument is a usable one.

Table 13

Summary of Parent Responses to MY PRESCHOOL CHILD (N=798)
September, 1971 (Total Sample)

	Mean*	Standard Deviation
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT		
MY CHILD:		
Dresses himself	1.55	.55
Buttons, snaps, and zips his clothing	1.45	.58
Goes to the toilet by himself	1.92	.29
Pays attention and concentrates well	1.33	.51
Follows simple directions without reminding	1.38	.52
Tells what he wants or needs	1.93	.27
Helps with simple household jobs	1.49	.55
Takes turns and shares with other children	1.45	.51
Takes good care of things he uses	1.39	.56
Prefers to play alone	.84	.43
Plays with a few children	1.54	.53
Plays with many children	1.16	.65
Remembers rules of games he plays	1.22	.61
LANGUAGE AND CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT		
MY CHILD:		
Speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	1.90	.33
Tells a simple story	1.53	.62
Identifies six or more colors	1.55	.73
Recites rhymes, sings songs	1.50	.65
Tells how things are alike or different	1.41	.62
Identifies a few letters of the alphabet	1.28	.80
Identifies many letters of the alphabet	.81	.90
Prints his first name correctly	.59	.82
Tells his: whole name	1.67	.62
address	.75	.79
telephone number	.32	.64
Counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	1.65	.65
Recognizes numerals 1 to 10	1.03	.83
Tells "how many" in a group of objects	1.46	.63
Identifies basic shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	1.19	.76
PHYSICAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT		
MY CHILD:		
Throws and catches a ball	1.59	.53
Can ride a tricycle or bicycle	1.96	.23
Runs, hops, and jumps	1.95	.22
Claps or marches in time with music	1.58	.59
Uses crayons with control	1.43	.67
Uses scissors with control	1.12	.71
Works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	1.35	.76

Table 13 (continued)

During the past 12 months, MY CHILD has had trouble with:

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Eating (too much or too little)	.69	.67
Sleeping (too much or too little)	.30	.52
Stomach irregularities	.20	.42
Getting along with children	.88	.70
Getting along with adults	.64	.77
Unusual fears	.41	.55
Nervousness	.33	.52
Thumbsucking	.36	.70
Overactivity	.49	.65
Sex	.09	.29
Daydreaming	.34	.51
Temper tantrums	.63	.57
Crying	.77	.55
Lying	.48	.54
Stealing	.05	.23
Tearing or breaking things	.43	.52
Wetting	.33	.60
Speech	.42	.64
INTERESTS AND EXPERIENCES		
MY CHILD:		
Enjoys looking at books	1.87	.36
Listens to stories and music	1.85	.37
Is read to	1.56	.53
Uses: paint	1.09	.75
playdoh or clay	1.35	.65
scissors	1.32	.67
crayons	1.76	.45
Has visited the zoo	1.35	.59
Has been to the library	1.03	.84
Has taken trips outside the community	1.58	.55
Attends or has attended Nursery School, Headstart, Sunday School	.97	.91
Watches Sesame Street	1.46	.64

*Scale scores range from 0 to 2

j. Process Objective Two

> Parent-Child Early Education pupils who have learning problems due to emotional disturbance, learn-disabilities (i.e., language and perceptual disorders), experiential deprivation, physical handicaps, low intellectual functioning, and mental retardation, will be identified as indicated by a preliminary screening battery.

All pupils entering the PCEE Program were administered a preliminary screening battery which included the Slosson Intelligence Test, the Grammatic Closure subtest of the ITPA, and the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration. Additional data were collected on all pupils from parent evaluation on the Behavior Checklist, "My Preschool Child" and teacher ratings on the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale." Of the 728 enrolled in the fall in the PCEE Program, 429 (59%) were referred for further diagnosis and observation because of suspected learning problems. In the previous two years of the program 48% of the children had been referred for further diagnosis and observation. However, the increase in numbers is due to the establishment of different criteria for selection of children with particular learning disabilities.

1) 250 (34%) were identified as having emotional problems using the Glidewell items from the Behavior Checklist and teacher ratings on the Nursery School Adjustment Scale. The proportion of children identified as having emotional problems is within the range

of 10% to 40% reported to be the norm in several studies.

2) 25 (3%) were referred for further diagnosis because of apparent low intellectual range. Of these pupils, three children's scores fell within the mentally retarded range and were receiving special services for their handicap. Two others were considered untestable. The remainder of the group were found to have various problems and appropriate counseling and suggestions were made to all parents. Home teaching activities provided a wealth of experience and it was felt that the initially low scores reflected environmental deprivation. The low number of cases considered mentally retarded compares very well to the national norms of 1% mental retardation in the population.

3) 227 (31%) were identified as having possible learning disabilities including language disorders or visual integration problems. Of this group, 30 were diagnosed to be learning disabled, especially in the Language area, and received special habilitative programs. Other children were observed and programming for hand-eye difficulties was given to the regular teacher by specialists involved in the program.

18 (2.5%) were referred for speech therapy. Of these, 12 children received help since it was felt that they had problems which could be corrected at this

age. Adding these together, the total number identified as learning disabled resembles the national estimate of 5% to 25% school aged population falling into this category.

63 (10%) were identified as having failed the screening testing for hearing. Further clinical testing indicated 31 children showing a loss on the clinical testing and 13 children showing normal hearing.

7 (1%) were identified as having visual problems. One child with a severe visual handicap also received help from the Delta Gamma Foundation.

It will be noted that the number of pupils identified as having learning problems due to various difficulties add up to more than the total who received final testing at the end of the school year. This is due to the fact that some pupils were identified as having multiple problems.

In comparing the identification of children with learning problems from year to year, the following information is presented.

Table 14

Children Identified as Having Possible Handicaps

Type	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
Speech	1%	6%	2.5%
Hearing	8%	10%	9%
Vision	3%	4%	1%
Learning Problems	5%	7%	31%
Mental Retardation	4%	3%	3%
Emotional Problems	37%	33%	34%

It should be pointed out that the percent of children identified as having problems on the basis of screening remained fairly constant over the three year period. In the area, however, of learning disabilities, there was a sharp increase. This was due to the fact that the criteria for selection was changed. More than half of these children showed a deficit on the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration. It was hypothesized that low scores on this test may have been caused by lack of experience. Observation during the year of these children with low scores on the Beery supported this belief. It should also be pointed out that a somewhat higher number of children received special teaching in language development.

In summary, we believe that our identification procedures are sound and are as good as the instruments we use. A sophistication in diagnosis has developed and we believe we are servicing the children who most need our help.

k. Process Objective Three

> Each Parent-Child Early Education pupil identified through further diagnostic procedures as having learning problems due to one or more of the factors listed in Process Objective Two will be given individualized materials and/or teaching strategies by his teacher as prescribed by consultant specialists for the handicapped.

Individualized learning programs and/or teaching strategies were prescribed for all children observed and diagnosed by the specialist staff to have learning problems. Eighty-eight children were given a diagnostic battery and approximately 165 additional children were observed. Programs prescribed for children with learning disabilities or in need of speech/language stimulation were implemented in home teaching visits by two teachers with training in learning disabilities, who are also qualified speech clinicians. Their work was monitored through inspection of weekly logs, and consultation and observation by the Consultant Specialist for Educational Problems and the Project Director. The two learning disabilities teachers also worked with children who were non-spontaneous learners or who had multiple problems in home visits once a week. Program recommendations and progress reports were communicated to the child's Saturday School teacher at weekly staff inservice meetings. All teachers were evaluated by the Project Director and Consultant as adequately carrying out these prescriptions. (See

Report, Sub-Component for the Learning Disabled, Patricia Teich, M.A. and Janie von Wolfseck, M.A. - Appendix Q.)

Children referred for psychological evaluation received individualized educational and behavioral prescriptions by the special education specialist and the psychological examiner. Other children, not referred for suspected mental retardation but observed by the teachers to be encountering learning difficulties were also programmed by the component. The two special education consultants observed behavior in every Saturday School session and made suggestions to the staff based on indepth task analysis. The one special education specialist also observed all the children who made a low score on the Beery Test of Motor Integration given in the initial screening. He ascertained if the problem was due to lack of experience or if a basic perceptual difficulty was evident by doing further testing.

Children considered in need of speech evaluation were observed by a learning specialist. The Coordinating Consultant from the Special School District also evaluated children with serious speech problems and others whose problems had not been fully determined.

Services provided by the Consultant Psychologist and the two Child Development Consultants for children screened as having possible emotional problems affecting learning included: indepth consultation and discussion with teachers; observation of behavior in the classroom; counseling with individual parents; and group meetings on child growth and family problems. Assistance was given to teachers with understanding causes of behavioral deviations, management strategies, and alternative approaches when necessary. Semiweekly consultations were held by these consultants who spent an hour with each team of teachers discussing behavior problems and family relationships. The Consultant Psychologist's Interim Report stated that to the best of his knowledge each teacher had attempted to implement the recommendations given and that teachers had been alert to the problems and had reported them to the Child Development Consultant. (See Final Report on Sub-Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D., Appendix P.)

Individual program prescriptions for the visually handicapped and hearing impaired from agencies such as Central Institute for the Deaf, the Consultant Audiologist, or private physicians, were carried out by the staff.

One child has a serious visual handicap. Besides receiving special home teaching from a learning disabilities specialist, the Delta Gamma Foundation is also providing special service to this child. A working relationship between the doctor, Delta Gamma, and this program resulted.

Joint staffings were held as needed involving staff specialists and the Project Director as well as staff specialists and the teaching staff to discuss teaching strategies and monitor progress of children with multiple problems or handicaps. Generally, all the resources, whether in the program or outside services, were utilized to provide assistance in complex situations. The Child Development Component was also involved in all cases that appeared to be largely educational in nature or complex cases involving educational concerns, behavioral problems, and family relationships. Their work was concentrated with parents in helping them to understand their problems and find ways to cope with them.

1. Process Objective Four a. (Rev. 8/71, Replacing Process Objective Four)

> The Project Evaluator and Project Director will select items from existing instruments to measure the self-esteem of pupils. Those items selected will be responded to by Parent-Child Early Education teachers at the beginning and end of the PCEE Program year.

The five rating scales on the instrument, "The Rating Scale of Self Esteem" were selected from Coopersmith's "Behavior Rating Form." On October 1, 1971 Dr. Boyd R. McCandless, Director, Educational Psychology Program, Emory University and noted author on child behavior and development consulted with the Project Director, Project Evaluator, and other staff members on measurement and evaluation of self esteem among four year olds. The discussion included the uses, practical and research, of the modification of the Coopersmith items. At this meeting Dr. McCandless indicated the instrument to be appropriate for the purpose designed. Verification of Dr. McCandless' consultation on this instrument is contained in his report to the Project Director dated October 4, 1971. Copies were sent to the Project Officer, USOE and to the Grants Officer on October 19, 1971.

SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

1) PCEE teachers rated pupils on their skill development in the Personal and Social, Language, Math and Science Concept, and Motor areas at the end of all three project years. The frequency distributions for each item rated are given in Appendices H-4, H-5, and H-6 for the first, second, and third program years respectively. Inspection of these appendices shows that the large majority (more than 65%) of PCEE pupils from all three project years attained competency in all of the skills listed in all areas. The proportions of pupils attaining competency varied from between 65% and 68% for first and second year pupils (on the item "child identifies many letters of the alphabet") to 99% (on the item "child speaks in sentences of five or more words"). The proportions of third year pupils attaining competency varied from 67% (on the item "child distinguishes words that rhyme") to 98% (shared by five of the three-point scales). In sum, it may be safely concluded that while not every child attained competency in each skill presented during each of the three project years, the vast majority of pupils did achieve what was expected of them in nearly all of the skills taught.

2) In preparation for the follow-up evaluation of Parent-Child Early Education pupils who will enter second grade in the fall, 1974, data were collected on the Stanford

Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Level I (SAT) in 1973. The data collected on those pupils entering second grade in 1973 were used to construct local percentile rank norms for each of the seven subtests of the SAT as well as for the two subtotal and total scores. These local norm data as well as the means, medians, standard deviations, reliability estimates and standard error estimates may be found in Appendices H-3a and H-3b.

3) The vast majority of kindergarten pupils in the school district received at least one home visit during the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years. After the visit, the kindergarten teacher rated the child and parent visited on a series of five-point rating scales taken from those in the Home Teaching Report. Comparisons were made contrasting the ratings of kindergarteners who had participated in the PCEE Program during its first and second years with those of kindergarteners who had no preschool experience of any kind. The results of these comparisons are given in Appendix H-8. An examination of this appendix shows that there were only three rating scales that significantly differentiated the PCEE from the control group during each of the school years. It was found the first project year parents were rated by teachers as more positive toward the home visit and more self-confident than were control parents. First project year PCEE pupils were rated as more outgoing than their controls. Second

project year parents were rated as using more positive motivation and reinforcement techniques with their children than were the parents in the control group. Second project year PCEE parents were also judged to be more competent than were control group parents.

2. THE PARENT

a. Product Objective One

> Each parent receiving home visits in the Parent-Child Early Education Program, who was rated by the teachers as being less than very positive in her attitudes toward the teaching session, the teacher, and her child, during the first Home-Teaching session, will increase in the positiveness of her attitudes by a minimum of one step on each five-point rating scale as assessed by the teacher during the last home visit of the program.

Following the first or second home teaching session in the fall of each of the three project years, and again after the last home visit in the spring, the teachers rated the parents of PCEE pupils on eleven five-point scales pertaining to parent attitudes. The items related to this objective, together with the _N_'s and percentages for each point of the scales, are presented in Appendix B. A summary of the results for the three project years, including initial and final means and standard deviations, paired observations _t_ test results, as well as the proportions of parents judged to be deficient (rated as "3" or less) on each of the five-point scales, is presented in Table 15.

Table 15
A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Parents' Attitudes Toward the Home Visit, the Child, and the Teacher

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Parent Attitude Toward the Teaching Session									
a. Positive vs. negative	First	704	Initial	4.17	.92	11.47	<.01	176	25
			Final	4.62	.66			62	9
	Second	637	Initial	4.60	.75	4.52	<.01	78	12
			Final	4.76	.62			32	5
	Third	650	Initial	4.63	.65	2.91	<.01	43	7
			Final	4.71	.61			30	5
b. Interested vs. disinterested	First	703	Initial	4.17	.92	9.41	<.01	175	25
			Final	4.57	.76			70	10
	Second	637	Initial	4.59	.75	3.82	<.01	78	12
			Final	4.73	.66			40	6
	Third	650	Initial	4.63	.68	3.16	<.01	49	8
			Final	4.72	.64			36	6
c. Self-confident vs. lacking self-confidence	First	703	Initial	3.74	1.03	16.17	<.01	290	41
			Final	4.43	.79			101	14
	Second	637	Initial	4.37	.90	6.93	<.01	120	19
			Final	4.62	.75			59	9
	Third	650	Initial	4.42	.84	5.31	<.01	97	15
			Final	4.60	.72			63	10

Table 15 (continued)

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Parent Interaction with Child	First	702	Initial	3.94	.94	14.42	<.01	228	32
			Final	4.51	.73			78	11
a. Accepting vs. unaccepting	Second	637	Initial	4.51	.82	3.69	<.01	92	14
			Final	4.64	.68			47	7
	Third	650	Initial	4.49	.77	3.76	<.01	79	12
			Final	4.61	.69			45	7
	First	702	Initial	3.50	1.03	16.33	<.01	342	49
			Final	4.21	.90			176	25
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Second	637	Initial	4.17	1.01	6.56	<.01	147	23
			Final	4.44	.82			83	13
	Third	650	Initial	4.16	1.05	5.70	<.01	169	26
			Final	4.38	.84			91	14
	First	702	Initial	3.62	.97	16.59	<.01	323	46
			Final	4.30	.84			128	18
c. Motivation positive vs. negative	Second	637	Initial	4.30	.91	5.76	<.01	136	21
			Final	4.51	.77			71	11
	Third	650	Initial	4.29	.95	5.63	<.01	133	20
			Final	4.50	.78			77	12
	First	702	Initial	3.57	.97	17.35	<.01	347	49
			Final	4.29	.83			128	18
d. Reinforcement positive vs. negative	Second	637	Initial	4.32	.92	5.14	<.01	134	21
			Final	4.50	.78			71	11
	Third	650	Initial	4.28	.95	6.12	<.01	132	20
			Final	4.51	.77			73	11
	First	702	Initial	3.74	.97	17.42	<.01	288	41
			Final	4.41	.80			106	15
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Second	637	Initial	4.36	.87	6.80	<.01	128	20
			Final	4.60	.74			60	9
	Third	650	Initial	4.35	.89	7.47	<.01	119	18
			Final	4.60	.68			46	7

Table 15 (continued)

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
Parent Relationship With Teacher									
a. Friendly vs unfriendly	First	702	Initial	4.35	.81	12.79	<.01	128	18
			Final	4.77	.56			34	5
	Second	637	Initial	4.66	.70	5.38	<.01	70	11
			Final	4.83	.50			21	3
	Third	650	Initial	4.71	.60	5.08	<.01	38	6
			Final	4.83	.49			18	3
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	First	702	Initial	4.32	.84	8.63	<.01	140	20
			Final	4.65	.72			61	9
	Second	637	Initial	4.64	.72	4.26	<.01	78	12
			Final	4.77	.57			29	5
	Third	650	Initial	4.66	.67	4.76	<.01	50	3
			Final	4.79	.52			20	3
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	First	701	Initial	4.07	.97	14.12	<.01	207	30
			Final	4.63	.69			62	9
	Second	637	Initial	4.48	.83	7.08	<.01	102	16
			Final	4.73	.61			34	5
	Third	650	Initial	4.50	.80	6.35	<.01	85	13
			Final	4.69	.60			31	5

It can be seen that the vast majority of parents were rated by their children's teachers as being positive toward, and interested in, the home teaching session initially (especially in the second and third project years). The large majority of parents were rated as being friendly toward, cooperative and at ease with, the teachers at the beginning of each project year. A somewhat smaller majority were found to be using appropriate modes of interacting with, and to have positive attitudes toward, their children at the beginning of each year. The ratings received by these parents at the end of the year were statistically significantly higher on all of the scales in the direction of more positive attitudes toward the teaching session, better modes of interaction with children, and better relationships with the teachers. Concomitantly, there were decreases in the proportions of parents judged to be deficient (rated as "3" or less) from initial to final ratings on every scale.

An analysis of individual parent changes from initial to final home teaching sessions for those parents judged to be deficient at the beginning of the three program years is given below.

Parent Attitude Toward Teaching Session

1) Positive versus negative attitudes

a) First Project Year - Of the 704 parents rated on this scale at both the beginning and end of the program year, 176 (25%) were judged to be deficient following the first home visit. Of the 176 parents, 33 (19%) gained one step, 112 (64%) gained two steps, and 15 (9%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 160 (91%) of the parents initially judged to be deficient in the positiveness of the attitudes gained one or more steps in their ratings at the end of the program year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 637 parents rated on this five-point scale at both the beginning and end of the program year, 78 (12%) were judged to be deficient initially. Of these 78 parents, 10 (13%) gained one step, 50 (64%) gained two steps, and seven (9%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 67 (86%) of the parents initially judged to be deficient in the positiveness of their attitudes gained one or more steps in their ratings at the end of the second program year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice on this scale, 43 (6%) were judged to be initially deficient on the positiveness of their attitudes. Of these 43 parents, 9 (21%) gained one step, 23 (53%) gained two steps, and five (12%) gained three steps. In sum, 37 (86%) of the 43 parents rated as initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion.

2) Interested versus disinterested

a) First Project Year - Of the 703 parents rated on this trait at the beginning and end of the program year, 175 (25%) were rated as deficient following the first home teaching session. Of these 175 parents, 25 (14%) gained one step, 116 (66%) gained two steps, and 15 (9%) gained three or more steps in the ratings made after the last home visit. Altogether, 156 (89%) of the parents initially rated as deficient in their interest gained one or more steps at the end of the program year.

b) Second Project Year - of the 78 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale, eight (10%) gained one step, 50 (64%) gained two steps, and seven (9%) gained three or more steps. In sum, 65 (83%) of the parents initially rated as deficient in their interest gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 49 (8%) were judged to be deficient initially in their interest. Of these 49 parents, 11 (22%) gained one step, 25 (51%) gained two steps, and seven (14%) gained three steps. In total, 43 (87%) of the 49 parents rated as initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

3) Self-confident versus lacking self-confidence

a) *First Project Year* - Two hundred and ninety (41%) of the 703 parents were rated as being initially deficient in this trait. Of these 290 parents, 72 (25%) gained one step, 153 (53%) gained two steps, and 32 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 257 (89%) of those parents rated as lacking in self-confidence at the beginning of the program year increased one step or more in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

b) *Second Project Year* - Of the 120 parents rated as deficient in this trait at the beginning of the program year, 25 (21%) gained one step, 64 (53%) gained two steps, and seven (6%) gained three or more steps. In total, 96 (80%) of those parents rated as lacking self-confidence initially increased one step or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

c) *Third Project Year* - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 97 (15%) were judged to be initially deficient in their self-confidence. Of these 97 parents, 31 (32%) gained one step, 37 (38%) gained two steps, and 12 (12%) gained three or more steps on their final ratings of this trait. In sum, 80 (82%) of the 97 parents initially rated as deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

Parent Interaction with Child

1) Accepting versus unaccepting

a) First Project Year - Two hundred and twenty-eight (32%) of the 702 parents were initially rated as being deficient in this trait. Of these 228 parents, 63 (28%) increased one step, 135 (59%) increased two steps, and 11 (5%) increased three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. In total, 209 (92%) of those parents rated as being deficient in acceptance of their children at the beginning of the program year increased one or more steps on this scale at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 92 parents rated as being initially deficient in this trait, 24 (26%) gained one step, 41 (45%) gained two steps, and 10 (11%) gained three steps or more in their final ratings. Altogether, 75 (82%) of those parents rated as being deficient in their acceptance of their children increased one or more steps on this scale at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 79 (12%) were found to be initially deficient in their acceptance. Of these 79 parents, 30 (38%) gained one step, 32 (41%) gained two steps, and six (8%) gained three steps in their final rating. In total, 68 (87%) of the 79 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

2) Aware versus unaware of needs

a) First Project Year - Three hundred and forty-two (49%) of 702 parents were found to be initially deficient in this trait. Of these 342 parents, 100 (29%) gained one step, 152 (44%) gained two steps, and 30 (9%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 282 (82%) of those parents judged to be lacking in awareness of their children's needs at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 147 parents found to be initially deficient in this trait, 46 (31%) gained one step, 52 (35%) gained two steps, and 22 (15%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 120 (82%) of those parents judged to be lacking in awareness of their children's needs at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 169 (26%) were rated as being initially deficient in their awareness of children's needs. Of these 169 parents, 67 (40%) gained one step, 63 (37%) gained two steps, and 11 (7%) gained three or more steps on their final ratings. In sum, 141 (84%) of the 169 parents judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

3) Motivation positive versus negative

a) First Project Year - Three hundred and twenty-three (46%) of 702 parents were initially rated as being deficient in their use of positive motivation with their children. Of these 323 parents, 98 (30%) increased one step, 153 (47%) increased two steps, and 19 (6%) increased three or more steps in their final ratings of this trait. In sum, 270 (84%) of those parents rated as being deficient on this scale at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 136 parents rated as "three" or less on this scale, 46 (34%) gained one step, 52 (38%) gained two steps, and seven (5%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 105 (77%) of those parents initially judged to be deficient in their use of positive motivation with their children gained one or more steps on their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 133 (20%) were rated as being initially deficient in their use of positive motivation. Of these 133 parents, 43 (32%) gained one step, 49 (37%)gained two steps, and 16 (12%) gained three or more steps on their final ratings. In total, 108 (81%) of the 133 parents judged to be initially deficient met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

4) Reinforcement positive versus negative

a) First Project Year - Three hundred and forty-seven (49%) of 702 parents were rated as "three" or less on this scale at the beginning of the program year. Of these 347 parents, 99 (29%) gained one step, 161 (46%) gained two steps, and 24 (7%) gained three or more steps in their ratings at the end of the year. Altogether, 284 (82%) of those parents initially judged to be deficient in the use of positive reinforcement with their children gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 134 parents rated as being deficient on this scale, 46 (34%) gained one step, 50 (37%) gained two steps, and seven (5%) gained three or more steps in their ratings at the end of the year. Altogether, 103 (77%) of those parents initially judged to be deficient in their use of positive reinforcement with their children gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 132 (20%) were judged to be initially deficient in their use of positive reinforcement. Of these 132 parents, 46 (35%) gained one step, 50 (38%) gained two steps, and 15 (11%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 111 (84%) of the 132 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

5) Competent versus incompetent

a) First Project Year - Two hundred and eighty-eight (41%) of 702 parents were rated as being deficient in this trait at the beginning of the program year. Of these 288 parents, 90 (31%) gained one step, 139 (48%) gained two steps, and 17 (6%) gained three or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year. In total, 246 (85%) of those parents rated as lacking in competence initially gained one or more steps on this scale in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 128 parents judged to be deficient in this trait at the beginning of the year, 41 (32%) gained one step, 54 (42%) gained two steps, and six (5%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 101 (79%) of those parents rated as lacking in competence initially gained one or more steps on this scale in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 119 (18%) were rated as being initially deficient on this scale. Of these 119 parents, 43 (36%) gained one step, 48 (40%) gained two steps, and 11 (9%) gained three steps in their final ratings. In total, 102 (85%) of the 119 parents judged to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

Parent Relationship with Teachers

1) Friendly versus unfriendly

a) First Project Year - One hundred and twenty-eight (18%) of 702 parents were rated as deficient in this trait initially. Of these 128 parents, 18 (14%) gained one step, 95 (74%) gained two steps, and 4 (3%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 117 (91%) of those parents rated as being deficient in their friendliness toward the teacher at the beginning of the program year gained one step or more in their ratings at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 70 parents rated as deficient on this scale, 11 (16%) gained one step, 52 (74%) gained two steps, and four (6%) gained three or more steps in their end of the year ratings. Altogether, 67 (96%) of those parents rated as deficient in their friendliness toward the teacher at the beginning of the year gained one or more steps in their ratings at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 38 (6%) were rated as being initially deficient on this scale. Of these 38 parents, seven (18%) gained one step, 21 (55%) gained two steps, and four (11%) gained three steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 32 (84%) of the 38 parents judged to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceed the criterion.

2) Cooperative versus uncooperative

a) First Project Year - One hundred and forty (20%) of 702 parents were judged to be initially deficient in this trait. Of these 140 parents, 21 (15%) gained one step, 95 (68%) gained two steps, and 7 (5%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 123 (88%) of those parents rated deficient in their cooperativeness with the teacher at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in their ratings of this trait at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 78 parents rated as initially deficient in this trait, 17 (22%) gained one step, 47 (60%) gained two steps, and four (5%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 68 (87%) of those parents initially rated as deficient in their cooperativeness with the teacher gained one or more steps in the final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 50 (8%) were judged to be initially deficient in their cooperation with the teacher. Of these 50 parents, 11 (22%) gained one step, 29 (58%) gained two steps, and 6 (12%) gained three steps in their final ratings. In total, 46 (92%) of the 50 parents initially rated as deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

3) At ease versus ill at ease

a) First Project Year - Two hundred and seven (30%) of 701 parents were rated as deficient on this scale at the beginning of the program year. Of these 207 parents, 45 (22%) gained one step, 115 (56%) gained two steps, and 22 (11%) gained three or more steps in their end of the year ratings. In total, 182 (88%) of those parents judged to be initially deficient in this trait gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 102 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale, 19 (19%) gained one step, 64 (63%) gained two steps, and seven (7%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 90 (88%) of those parents rated as being deficient in this trait at the beginning of the year gained one or more steps on this scale at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 650 parents rated twice, 85 (13%) were judged to be initially deficient in this trait. Of these 85 parents, 30 (35%) gained one step, 35 (41%) gained two steps, and 10 (12%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 75 (88%) of the 85 parents rated as being deficient in their first ratings of this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

* * *

In general, the vast majority of the parents rated by the teachers at the end of each project year on their attitudes toward the home teaching session, their interaction with their children, and their relationship with teachers were found to be: positive in their attitudes toward, and interested in, the teaching session; showing self-confidence; accepting of their children; aware of their children's needs; using positive motivation and reinforcement techniques; competent in their interaction with their children; and friendly toward, and cooperative and at ease with, the teacher. Of those parents initially rated as deficient in these traits, not all increased by the minimum of one step as stated in the objective. However, between 77% and 96% of the parents from the three project years achieved this goal on the different rating scales. These figures represent reasonably close approximations to the goal of 100% achievement of the criterion.

b. Product Objective Two

> Each parent participating in the Parent-Child Early Education Program who was observed by the teacher to be deficient in using appropriate teaching techniques during the parent's first Saturday School session will increase, by a minimum of one step on a five-point rating scale, her use of appropriate techniques as assessed by the teacher during the parent's last Saturday School session in the program. Appropriate teaching techniques include appropriateness of reinforcement techniques used by parents and the extent to which parents accomplished the objectives of the lessons assigned.

All parents were rated by PCEE teachers on a series of three five-point rating scales at the beginning and end of the first PCEE Program year. During the second and third project years, a random sample of approximately 25% of the parents were so rated. A summary of the results obtained from all three project years is given in Table 16. For the complete frequency tabulations of rating obtained at the beginning and end of each program year, refer to Appendix I.

Table 16

A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Parents' Performance in Saturday School

Item	Project Year		N*	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient**	
								N	%
1. Used appropriate versus inappropriate teaching techniques	First	Initial	670	4.02	.85	15.15	<.01	186	28
		Final		4.41	.75			89	13
	Second	Initial	159	4.23	.88	3.83	<.01	38	24
		Final		4.46	.77			22	14
	Third	Initial	146	4.24	.77	<1	n.s.	24	16
		Final		4.30	.88			27	18
2. Used positive versus negative reinforcement	First	Initial	670	4.04	.90	14.44	<.01	181	27
		Final		4.43	.77			92	14
	Second	Initial	159	4.22	.89	5.00	<.01	32	20
		Final		4.52	.71			18	11
	Third	Initial	146	4.25	.78	<1	n.s.	27	18
		Final		4.32	.81			23	16
3. Accomplished versus did not accomplish task assigned	First	Initial	670	4.27	.83	13.19	<.01	132	20
		Final		4.61	.66			57	9
	Second	Initial	160	4.38	.83	3.20	<.01	24	15
		Final		4.55	.71			17	11
	Third	Initial	146	4.32	.79	<1	n.s.	21	14
		Final		4.32	.79			20	14

*During the first project year all parents were rated whereas during the two succeeding years a sample of approximately 25% was randomly drawn.

**Deficiency was defined as a rating of "3" or less on each five-point scale.

It may be seen in the table that more than 70% of the parents from the first two project years were initially judged to be using appropriate techniques and accomplishing the tasks assigned to them (i.e., were rated as "4" or higher). During the third project year the initial proportion of parents so rated increased to approximately 85%. The proportion of parents judged to be using appropriate techniques by the end of the first two project years was approximately 85%, equivalent to the initial third year ratings. The third year parents, on the other hand, remained fairly much at the same level in their final ratings as they had on their initial ratings. Thus, there were statistically significant differences in the direction of greater use of appropriate teaching techniques and positive reinforcement as well as parent accomplishment of the tasks assigned in the first two years of project operation but not in the third.

Analyses of individual changes for those parents judged to be initially deficient showed the following:

1) Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques

a) First Project Year - Of the 186 parents rated as deficient in their use of appropriate teaching techniques at the beginning of the year, 98 (53%) increased one step and 29 (5%) increased two or more steps by the end of the year. Altogether, 127 parents (68%) of those initially rated as deficient in this trait increased their ratings by one or more steps on this five-point scale.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 38 parents rated as deficient in their use of appropriate teaching techniques at the beginning of the second program year, 13 (34%) increased one step and ten (26%) increased two steps in their ratings at the end of the year. Altogether 23 (61%) of those initially deficient in this trait increased their ratings by one or more steps on this five-point scale.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 24 parents rated as "3" or less on this five-point scale at the beginning of the year, seven (29%) gained one step and six (25%) gained two steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 13 (54%) met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

2) Used positive versus negative reinforcement

a) First Project Year - One hundred and eighty-one parents were rated as deficient in their use of positive reinforcement at the beginning of the program year. Of these parents, 83 (46%) gained one step and 35 (19%) gained two or more steps in their ratings by the end of the year. In sum, 118 parents (65%) of those parents rated as being initially deficient in this trait gained one or more steps on the five-point scale.

b) Second Project Year - Thirty-two parents were rated as deficient in their use of positive reinforcement at the beginning of the second program year. Of these parents, 14 (44%) gained one step and nine (28%) gained two steps in their ratings by the end of the year. In sum, 23 (72%) of those parents rated as being initially deficient in this trait gained one or more steps on this five-point scale.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 27 parents judged to be deficient in this trait initially, 13 (48%) gained one step and four (15%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In total, 17 (63%) of the parents rated as being initially deficient in their use of positive reinforcement met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

3) Accomplished versus did not accomplish the task assigned

a) First Project Year - One hundred and thirty-two parents were rated as not accomplishing the tasks assigned to them at the beginning of the program year. Of these parents, 50 (38%) gained one step and 43 (33%) gained two or more steps in their end of the year ratings. Altogether, 93 parents (70%) increased their ratings on this trait by one or more steps.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 24 parents rated as not accomplishing the tasks assigned to them at the beginning of the second program year, 11 (46%) gained one step and six (25%) gained two steps in their ratings at the end of the year. Altogether, 17 (71%) of those parents rated as being initially deficient in this trait gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 21 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale, seven (33%) gained one step and seven (33%) gained two steps in their final ratings. In sum, 14 (67%) of those parents rated as being initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion.

The majority of those parents initially judged to be deficient on the three scales met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their final ratings in all three project years. These findings probably represent a more realistic expectation than that set forth in the objective.

c. Product Objective Three

> As a result of attending Parent Study Groups, parents will demonstrate greater knowledge of the principles of child development and appropriate interaction techniques by answering 10% more of the items correctly on the test given at the end of the last session than they had on the test given at the beginning of the first session.

Forty-seven parents attended a four-week short-course on communicating with their child, entitled, "Are You Listening?" during the winter of 1973. During the first and last sessions 32 parents responded to items of the "Parent Effectiveness Training Scales." A summary of results is given in Table 17.

Table 17

Initial and Final Responses to Items of the Parent Effectiveness Training Scales Administered to Parents Attending Group Sessions (N = 32)

Item		U*	L	?	Z**	p
1. Physically remove your child from the piano when he refuses to stop banging on it after you have told him it is becoming unbearable to you	Initial	3 (9%)	29 (91%)	0 (0%)	<1	n.s.
	Final	5 (16%)	27 (84%)	0 (0%)		
2. Praise your child for being consistently prompt in coming home to dinner	Initial	8 (25%)	22 (69%)	2 (6%)	1.06	n.s.
	Final	13 (41%)	19 (59%)	0 (0%)		
3. Scold your six year old child if he demonstrates objectionable table manners in front of guests	Initial	14 (44%)	15 (47%)	3 (9%)	2.41	<.02
	Final	24 (75%)	7 (22%)	1 (3%)		

(continued)

Table 17 (continued)

Item		U*	L	?	Z**	p
4. Punish your child when he uses an objectionable swear word	Initial	20 (62%)	9 (28%)	3 (9%)	1.77	.02
	Final	27 (84%)	4 (12%)	1 (3%)		
5. Make your child apologize to another child he has treated very discourteously	Initial	8 (25%)	24 (75%)	0 (0%)	1.51	n.s.
	Final	13 (41%)	19 (59%)	0 (0%)		
6. Make your child eat almost everything on his plate before being allowed to leave	Initial	19 (59%)	12 (38%)	1 (3%)	1.79	n.s.
	Final	25 (78%)	7 (22%)	0 (0%)		
7. Punish or deny your child something when you catch him telling a lie	Initial	14 (44%)	15 (47%)	3 (9%)	1.58	n.s.
	Final	22 (69%)	9 (28%)	1 (3%)		
8. Punish or reprimand your child for stealing money out of your purse	Initial	3 (9%)	26 (81%)	3 (9%)	2.60	.01
	Final	15 (47%)	14 (44%)	3 (9%)		
9. Insist that your child perform when he is asked to do so for relatives or guests	Initial	30 (94%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	<1	n.s.
	Final	32 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
10. Make your two year old remain on the toilet until he has performed his "duty," when you know he has to go	Initial	28 (88%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	<1	n.s.
	Final	28 (88%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)		
11. Set up a system whereby your child can earn some kind of reward if he regularly does his chores around home.	Initial	10 (31%)	21 (66%)	1 (3%)	<1	n.s.
	Final	13 (41%)	19 (59%)	0 (0%)		

(continued)

Table 17 (continued)

Item		U*	L	?	Z**	p
12. Punish or threaten to punish your child if he eats between meals after you have told him not to	Initial Final	18 (56%) 23 (72%)	13 (41%) 7 (22%)	1 (3%) 2 (6%)	1.58	n.s.
13. Punish or scold your child for not cleaning up his room after making a mess of it during play	Initial Final	10 (31%) 21 (66%)	22 (69%) 9 (28%)	0 (0%) 2 (6%)	2.94	<.01
14. Scold your child for carelessly breaking or ruining one of his expensive toys	Initial Final	7 (22%) 20 (62%)	24 (75%) 12 (38%)	1 (3%) 0 (0%)	2.75	<.01
15. Punish or scold your child for "sassing" you or saying something disrespectful	Initial Final	5 (16%) 20 (62%)	26 (81%) 8 (25%)	1(3%) 4(12%)	3.75	<.01
16. Make your child stop bringing his toys into the living room when it gets too cluttered	Initial Final	6 (19%) 3 (9%)	26 (81%) 29 (91%)	0 (0%) 0 (0%)	<1	n.s.
17. Make your child clean up his own mess when he carelessly spills food on the rug	Initial Final	19 (59%) 12 (38%)	12 (38%) 18 (56%)	1 (3%) 2 (6%)	2.27	<.05
18. Tell your child she is a good girl or reward her when she remains still while you are combing her hair	Initial Final	6 (19%) 11 (34%)	24 (75%) 20 (62%)	2 (6%) 1 (3%)	1.06	n.s.

(continued)

Table 17 (continued)

Item		U*	L	?	Z**	p
19. Punish your child for continuing to play in his room after you thought he had gone to sleep at his bedtime	Initial	25 (78%)	6 (19%)	1 (3%)	1.78	n.s.
	Final	29 (91%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)		
20. Set up a system of rewards for your child if he habitually washes his hands before coming to the table	Initial	19 (59%)	10 (31%)	3 (9%)	1.50	n.s.
	Final	26 (81%)	5 (16%)	1 (3%)		
21. Make your child stop or punish him when you catch him fingering his genitals	Initial	20 (62%)	11 (34%)	1 (3%)	1.00	n.s.
	Final	21 (66%)	9 (28%)	2 (6%)		
22. Punish or reprimand your children for fighting loudly with each other over a toy	Initial	8 (25%)	22 (69%)	2 (6%)	2.02	<.05
	Final	17 (53%)	13 (41%)	2 (6%)		
23. Praise or reward your child for not crying when he doesn't get his way or has his feelings hurt	Initial	13 (41%)	19 (59%)	0 (0%)	2.02	<.05
	Final	21 (66%)	11 (34%)	0 (0%)		
24. Threaten to punish or reprimand your child for telling you he won't go on an errand after you have asked him several times	Initial	14 (44%)	18 (56%)	0 (0%)	2.47	<.02
	Final	22 (69%)	8 (25%)	2 (6%)		

(continued)

Table 17 (continued)

Item		U*	L	?	Z**	p
25. Tell your daughter that you will buy her something she has been wanting if she keeps her dress clean until you go out to dinner a couple of hours from now	Initial Final	28 (88%) 29 (91%)	4 (12%) 3 (9%)	0 (0%) 0 (0%)	<1	n.s.
26. Punish or reprimand your child when you see him pulling up the skirt of the girl next door and embarrassing her	Initial Final	9 (28%) 16 (50%)	22 (69%) 14 (44%)	1 (3%) 2 (6%)	2.00	<.05

*U = Unlike me
L = Like me
? = Uncertain, or do not understand
**Z The Z test for the significance of the difference between two correlated proportions was used to determine whether parental responses to the U and L categories had changed.

Inspection of this table shows that the parents showed statistically significant changes, in a more positive direction, on eleven of the twenty-six three-point scales. These items were concerned mainly with the use of punishment as a means of communicating with the child. Fewer parents rated themselves as using punishment during the last session than had been the case during the first session of the short-course. There were no significant shifts on the items dealing with the use of praise as a means of dealing with parent-child problems.

When first and last session ratings were compared by individuals to determine whether the criterion of a 10% gain in the numbers of correct responses was achieved it was found that 4 (12%) of the parents had increased by three points (the equivalent to 12%), 11 (34%) of the parents had increased by four to six points (the equivalent from 15 to 23 of the items correct), and seven (22%) of the parents had increased their scores from 7 to 14 points (the equivalent from 27 to 54 of the items correct. Five (16%) of the parents gained one to two points on their final ratings and five (16%) parents either did not change or regressed in the total scores. Altogether, 22 (69%) of the parents achieved the criterion set for them of a 10% gain in the number of items correct.

During the third project year 18 parents attended a similar short-course on communication of whom 14 responded to both pre and posttests. Due to an error on the part of the instructor most of the parents did not identify themselves on the pretest. The number of parents who did identify themselves on both forms left too small a number to deal with either meaningfully or statistically. Therefore, the results of the third program year have been omitted.

Other meetings were held with parents throughout the school year by members of the child development team. In October, a meeting entitled Growing Up OK - The Early Years was held in each elementary Saturday School Center. In January and again in March and April, meetings were held in each school center on the topic How Does Your Garden Grow. We believe these meetings were well attended and by offering a variety of services to parents throughout the school year, we were able to meet parents' concerns when they occurred. The report of these meetings is presented in the final report, Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D. - Appendix P. Note results of parent survey of these meetings in Appendix A of the report for the Emotionally Handicapped.

d. Process Objective One

> One parent from each family participating in the Parent-Child Early Education Program will volunteer to assist in Saturday School and will assist with one class at least once every two months.

Attendance records of parent assistance in Saturday School show that of the 719 families rated on this objective through December, 1973, 666 families (93%) served at least once during the first 11 sessions. Parents or parent substitutes from 496 (68%) of the parents served two or more times, while 170 (23%) assisted once. It is interesting to note that the percentage of some parent participation ranged between 98%-99% in each teaching center.

In looking at the total year, parent volunteers would have been expected to assist in Saturday School at least four times. The following indicates the percent of parents who met the criteria, the percent who served one, two, or three times; and the percent of those not serving at all.

Table 18

	Population	No. of Parents Serving	% Serving 4 or More Times	% Serving 1, 2, 3, Times	% Not Serving
Team I	127	114	65%	32%	3%
II	136	130	70%	27%	3%
III	106	103	78%	20%	2%
IV	95	92	70%	26%	3%
V	125	121	70%	28%	2%
VI	132	132	72%	28%	0%
	721	702 Avg.	71%	27%	2%

It should be noted that only 16 children out of a possible group of 721 was not represented by parent assistance on Saturday throughout the school year. On the other hand, there were a large number of families who far exceeded the expected criterion.

Although we did not meet 100% parent achievement of this objective during the three program years, there was outstanding support from parents.

	Year I	Year II	Year III
Percent of Parents Who Met the Criteria of Serving at Least Once Every Two Months	62%	78%	71%

It is interesting to point out that socio-economic level was not a factor in determining parent participation. The percent of parent involvement was rather constant in all Saturday School Centers. The high percent of parent involvement was due to the fine relationship established by the teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

e. Process Objective Two

> Each parent receiving home visits will follow instructional procedures (use activities or materials suggested by the teacher during the previous visit).

Data pertaining to this objective were obtained after the first and last home teaching sessions of each project year. A tabulation of ratings on the three-point scales used to evaluate this objective for the three project years may be found in Appendix B. A summary of comparisons between initial and final ratings on this scale is given in Table 19.

Table 19
A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Parents' Use of Activities and Materials Suggested by Teachers

Rating Scale	Project Scale	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Did not Use Materials or Activities N	%
arents sed ma- terials or ctivities uggested	First	691	Initial	.73	1.04	7.86	<.01	329	48
			Final	.80	.77			177	26
	Second	638	Initial	.80	.84	10.33	<.01	292	46
			Final	1.23	.76			129	20
	Third	646	Initial	1.11	.70	<1	n.s.	127	20
			Final	1.11	.70			128	20

It may be seen that large proportions of parents were judged to be deficient on this scale during the first and second project years (i.e., received a rating of "0" on this three point scale). By the end of the first two project years, there were substantial decreases in the proportions of parents who were rated as not having used the activities or materials suggested. This is also reflected in the statistically significant paired observations t test results. During the third project year, however, a much smaller proportion of parents was rated as using no materials during the first home visit. This initial figure for third year parents is, in fact, identical to that obtained at the end of the year for the second project year. The proportion of parents deficient on this scale remained constant in the third year end-of-the-year ratings thus giving rise to the non-statistically significant t test result.

In general, between 52% and 80% of the parents were initially rated as using one or more activities or materials suggested by the teacher. By the end of the year between 74% and 80% of the parents used at least one activity suggested. These figures fairly well approximate the goal of having all parents use at least one activity suggested by the teacher by the end of the project year.

f. Process Objective Three

> Parent Study Groups will be established with parents, guidance counselors, and project staff members determining the content, structure, and frequency of group meetings.

At the beginning of the school year, the members of the Child Development Component held meetings in each school center on the subject Growing Up OK - The Early Years. Approximately one hundred fifty parents of four year olds and kindergarten children attended these informal meetings which emphasized what is normal in growing up and allowed time for parent interaction.

On January 26, February 2, and February 9, the specialists of the Child Development Component again met with parents informally in the various Saturday School Centers. The program entitled, "How is Your Family Growing?" discussed problems and concerns of those attending. A flyer announcing the program pointed to many areas for discussion such as socializing, developing initiative and independence, dealing with aggression and rivalry, etc. Parents checked those items of most concern to them and added additional questions. This served as the basis for discussion. Similar sessions were held on March 23, 30, and April 6. Again, parents had the opportunity to discuss problems, share ways of solving them, and realize that many problems are normal in child development and not a result of parent failure.

A four week short course for parents on communicating with their child, entitled "Are You Listening?" was conducted by an elementary guidance counselor on April 16, 23, 30, and May 7 for parents of Saturday School children. This forum for discussion resulted in much interaction by the parents attending.

The child psychologist and the two child development consultants have met with parents on an individual basis and accelerated this contact particularly during the later half of the school year. This discussion of the study groups and parent interviews may be found in the Final Report - Sub-Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D. - Appendix P.

SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

An attempt was made to determine whether parents who had the experience of assisting in Saturday School would be more likely to volunteer to assist in kindergarten classes than parents whose children had not participated in the PCEE Program. During the 1973-1974 school year, tallies were made of the number of parents helping in all but one of the elementary schools in the district. Of the 869 children in these schools, the parents of 416 (48%) assisted in the kindergarten program. More than half of these parents served on a regular or weekly basis. Of the 416 parents, 308 (74%) were the parents of second project year PCEE pupils. The remaining 108 parents (26%) had not had children involved in the PCEE Program. Approximately 62% of the pupils in kindergarten had participated in the PCEE Program during the preceding year. Therefore, by chance alone, one would expect about 258 of those 416 parents who assisted in kindergarten to be parents of PCEE pupils. Instead, the figure was 308 or 74%. This percentage is statistically significantly different ($x^2 = 25.50$; $p < .001$) than what would be expected. It may therefore be concluded that parents of PCEE pupils assisted in kindergarten more often than did parents of pupils who had not participated in the project.

3. THE STAFF

a. Product Objective One

> Each Parent-Child Early Education teacher will utilize appropriate motivational techniques (e.g., reinforcement and feedback strategies) for environmentally disadvantaged and handicapped pupils. By the end of the first year of project operation, each PCEE teacher will be rated at least a "four" on a five-point rating scale as assessed by the Project Director through classroom observations.

Data were collected on items relating to this objective by the Project Director during Saturday School classes at the beginning and end of each project year and during one home visit with each teacher midyear. During the second and third program years, ratings on these items were also made by elementary principals during one home visit made by them in the middle of the year. (See Appendix K.)

The beginning and end of the year Saturday School ratings were compared using paired observations *t* tests. A summary of the results is given in Table 20.

Table 20
A Summary of Initial and Final Ratings of Teacher Use of Appropriate Teaching, Reinforcement, and Motivational Techniques

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient* N	Deficient* %
Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	First	25	Initial	3.64	.83	9.80	<.01	11	44
			Final	4.44	.71			3	12
	Second	24	Initial	3.25	.68	5.00	<.01	19	79
			Final	4.08	.78			6	25
	Third	17	Initial	3.65	.70	1.46	n.s.	8	47
			Final	3.88	.70			5	29
Aware vs. unaware of children's needs	First	25	Initial	3.68	.63	6.53	<.01	9	36
			Final	4.32	.69			3	12
	Second	24	Initial	3.00	.71	5.87	<.01	18	75
			Final	3.72	.61			6	25
	Third	17	Initial	3.53	.80	3.05	<.01	9	53
			Final	4.12	.60			2	12
Used positive vs. negative motivation	First	25	Initial	3.84	.69	5.20	<.01	7	28
			Final	4.44	.58			1	4
	Second	24	Initial	3.46	.88	7.71	<.01	11	46
			Final	4.71	.55			1	4
	Third	17	Initial	4.41	.51	2.07	n.s.	0	0
			Final	4.76	.44			0	0
Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	First	25	Initial	3.80	.71	5.63	<.01	8	32
			Final	4.44	.58			1	4
	Second	24	Initial	3.33	.87	7.29	<.01	12	50
			Final	4.71	.55			1	4
	Third	17	Initial	4.41	.51	2.38	<.05	0	0
			Final	4.82	.39			0	0
Accomplished task objectives: 0-100%	First	25	Initial	3.44	.58	4.00	<.01	14	56
			Final	3.84	.37			4	16
	Second	24	Initial	3.33	.64	10.14	<.01	16	67
			Final	4.62	.58			1	4
	Third	17	Initial	4.18	.81	1	n.s.	4	24
			Final	4.24	.66			2	12

*Deficiency was defined as a score of three or less on each five-point scale.

It can be seen that rather large proportions of teachers were judged to be deficient in their use of appropriate teaching techniques and in their awareness of children's needs at the beginning of all three project years. By the end of the first two years, however, there were significant decreases in the numbers of teachers rated as deficient in these traits. During the first two project years, large proportions of teachers were rated as initially deficient in their use of positive motivation and reinforcement techniques. (No teacher was judged deficient on these scales at either the beginning or end of the third project year.) At the end of the first two project years, there were statistically significant decreases in the numbers of teachers judged to be deficient in these traits. In fact, only one teacher was so rated in each of the years. Large proportions of teachers were initially judged to be deficient in accomplishing task objectives during the first two project years. Again, there were statistically significant decreases in the proportions of teachers so judged at the end of each of the two years.

In general, sizeable proportions of teachers were rated as being deficient (i.e., average or below average on the five-point scales) at the beginning of the first two project years. By the end of those first two years, most of those teachers judged to be deficient showed that they had changed sufficiently so as to be rated as using appropriate techniques. Between 84% and 96% reached the criterion set for them by the end of the first project year; between 75% and 96% of the teachers reached the criterion set for them by the end of the second project year; and between 71% and 100% of the teachers reached the criterion during the third project year. While 100% achievement of the criterion was not reached on all five scales, it was met on two of the scales during the final project year and fairly well approximated on the other three scales.

b. Product Objective Two

> Each Parent-Child Early Education teacher will be able to correctly identify learning problems due to emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, experiential deprivation, physical handicaps, and mental retardation on the basis of observation of pupils in the learning situation. Evidence of correct identification will be demonstrated by the accuracy of their referrals as judged by the Consultant Specialists for the Handicapped.

The initial identification of learning problems was made by the Consultant in Learning Disabilities, the Learning Disabilities Specialists, and the Consultant in Emotional Disturbances. They jointly reviewed the initial screening battery results on all pupils entering the PCEE Program and recommended further diagnosis as needed. Subsequent referrals throughout the year have been made by teachers based on their observations and work with the children and their parents. By May, 1974, using a referral form, 32 children have been referred for learning problems, 36 for possible speech therapy, and 94 for emotional and behavior problems. Some of these children had already been identified by the specialists. Other children have been referred informally by direct communication with the consultant. Specialists believed that the lower number of children referred for speech therapy is a result of inservice training on the subject of speech problems at age 4. A better understanding of speech development is indicated on the part of teachers.

In periodic staffings on children, the Consultant Specialists have indicated to the Project Director that teachers have been generally perceptive of learning problems. This objective is discussed in detail as it relates to emotionally handicapped children in Appendix P.

In summary, the report says, "In the majority of cases those referred are children whose needs have been sufficiently glaring as to command the sensitive attention of the teacher. A much smaller proportion of these children were discussed through the initiative of the Consultant following review of the child's record or observation in the classroom."

"Throughout the year, we were repeatedly impressed with the sensitivity and astuteness of the teaching staff in initiating referrals. While the range and severity of problems was varied, the appropriateness of the referrals was never in question. We are aware of no instance of an inappropriate referral. These impressions are further substantiated by the already described rather good agreement between teacher judgments of low adjustment in children and earlier screening assessments by the consultant."

c. Product Objective Three

> For those Parent-Child Early Education pupils identified through further diagnostic procedures as having learning problems due to emotional disturbance, etc., teachers will carry out prescriptions (individualized materials and/or teaching techniques) made by the Consultant Specialists for the Handicapped. Through systematic observations, the specialists will determine whether or not each teacher is following the prescriptions.

This Objective was previously discussed under THE CHILD, Process Objective Three and related Appendices P and Q.

d. Product Objective Four

> Parent-Child Early Education teachers will establish positive relationships with parents in Saturday School and Home Teaching. Teachers will do this by showing that they respect parents' competencies in teaching children. This will be systematically monitored by the Project Director and periodically by elementary principals and parents.

Data were collected on teachers' modes of interacting with parents during Saturday School at the beginning and end of each program year and during one home visit midyear as rated by the Project Director. Elementary principals also rated the second and third project year teachers on these traits during their midyear home visits. (See Appendix K for a complete frequency tabulation of these ratings.) The initial and final Saturday School ratings made by the Project Director were compared using paired observations t tests. A summary of the results obtained for the three years of project operation is given in Table 21.

Table 21

A Summary of Initial and Final Ratings of Teachers' Relationships with Parents

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Respect for parent competencies: evident vs. not-evident	First	25	Initial	3.76	.66	4.41	<.01	7	28
			Final	4.28	.61			2	8
	Second	24	Initial	3.58	.72	5.44	<.01	13	54
			Final	4.33	.56			1	4
	Third	17	Initial	4.53	.51	<1	n.s.	0	0
			Final	4.65	.61			0	0
Relationship with parents: positive vs. negative	First	25	Initial	3.80	.65	7.86	<.01	8	32
			Final	4.52	.65			2	8
	Second	24	Initial	3.75	.79	4.73	<.01	9	38
			Final	4.38	.58			1	4
	Third	17	Initial	4.47	.51	1.14	n.s.	0	0
			Final	4.65	.49			0	0

It can be seen that substantial proportions of teachers were rated as being deficient in their respect for parent competencies and in their relationships with parents during the first two project years. By the end of each of these project years, there were statistically significant improvements in the ratings of these teachers.

During the third program year, no teacher was judged deficient on either of the two scales, either initially or finally. Thus, during the final project year, the goal of 100% attainment of the criterion of no deficiency was met.

e. Product Objective Five

> Weekly Home Activity Packets that complement the instruction given in Saturday School (as described in the staff activities component) will be developed by the Project Director, Parent-Child Early Education teachers, Specialists for the Handicapped, and the Project Disseminator. The content validity of these materials will be judged by an early childhood specialist as well as by teachers' reports based on the appropriateness and usability of these materials with PCEE pupils.

Home activity guides prepared by the staff were given to the parents weekly suggesting the games and activities for use at home relating to the skills being taught at school. Teachers assisted parents in selecting from the broad range of activities in each guide those activities that were most appropriate to their child's level of readiness.

At the conclusion of the first project year, the weekly activity guides from the entire year were compiled and have become a part of the dissemination of the program. During the second year, the home activity guides were revised, and this job was completed during the third project year. The guides were changed as to sequence of skills and a memo to parents was added. In addition, at the request of teachers, fewer activities were presented so that parents would not feel overwhelmed.

During the three project years, teachers were asked at midyear to evaluate the appropriateness and usability of the activities in the Home Activity Guides. A summary of their responses over a three-year period of time is as follows:

1) How appropriate are the activities in the Home Activity Guide?

	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
Very Appropriate	88%	38%	65%
Appropriate	8%	38%	29%
Not Appropriate	4%	24%	6%

Some teachers felt that the activities were too difficult for their children while others felt the need for more challenging tasks. However, during the third project year, teachers expressed the belief that the Activity Guides were in better sequence. They also believed that they were responsible for getting the parents to use the Home Activity Guide to a greater extent.

2) In regard to the question: How useful are they to parents? - the teachers commented as follows:

	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
Very useful	60%	25%	65%
Useful	28%	29%	29%
Somewhat Useful	12%	46% (depending on the parent)	6%

During the Home Visit, teachers point out to the parent specific tasks in the Home Activity Guide that can be useful to their child. The Guide appears to be very useful to parents who take the time. Based on the growth that teachers have noted, it is evident that many parents have given much time to their child. It should also be pointed out that at the beginning of the current school year, a bulletin on how to use the Home Activity Guide was prepared. Teachers discussed this bulletin with parents as they distributed the first Home Activity Guide in a home teaching visit. It is certain that the validity of these materials is dependent on how teachers encourage parents to use them.

In the Interim Audit Report, April 1974, the auditor comments that these guides have much to commend them. "They are succinct, well-written, easy to follow and, in general, are activities that both parents and children should enjoy and from which both should learn. Further, these guides should provide an important dimension to the dissemination of this project."

f. Product Objective Six

> A Parent-Child Early Education Curriculum Guide will be developed by the Project Director and PCEE teachers. The guide which will include performance objective and a sequence of activities to meet each objective will be integrated into the district Early Childhood Curriculum Guide Series already developed for kindergarten and beginning primary levels. Monthly planning charts will also be developed listing the major concepts to be introduced in Saturday School along with a record of each child's progress toward mastery. The Guide will be reviewed for its content validity by an early childhood education specialist and for its appropriateness and feasibility by the PCEE teachers and Project Director.

In the first year of the project we took the initial steps in developing a curriculum guide, using as a reference inventories of basic skills and behaviors, including the skill outline developed in the DARCEE Project, Valett's Psychoeducational Inventory of Basic Learning Abilities, the district Early Childhood Curriculum Guide Series, and the district Gross Motor Guide. The Sequence Charts of Skill Development are designed as basic outlines around which teachers plan their monthly programs. Learning activities developed from the Sequence Charts focus on the development of: language skills, math and science concepts, perceptual skills, physical skills, the creative arts, and personal and social growth. Items on the outlines such as "Recognizes numerals 1 - 5" followed by "Recognizes numerals 0 - 10" allow for evaluation on whatever level the child is working.

An analysis of the skills list from the first year of the project indicated that most of the objectives were presented in proper sequence. SEveral skill items presented toward the end of the program were rearranged in sequence. The Sequence Chart divided into five time periods contains language skills, math and science concepts, perceptual and physical skills. Behavior items, such as "Expresses feelings in acceptable ways," are observed and evaluated throughout the year.

During the second year of the project, a first draft of a curriculum guide was developed. Since then, teachers have been engaged at frequent intervals in establishing and clarifying criteria for all objectives. At the beginning of the third project year, the skills list was revised and additional skills were added. Part of the inservice period was devoted to interpreting these new objectives.

The teaching staff evaluated the usefulness and appropriateness of the Sequence Charts of Skill Development and of the skills themselves in January, 1974. The responses of the teachers to the following questions are summarized as follows:

1) How useful are the monthly skill development outlines?

15 (89%)	Very useful
2 (11%)	Useful

2) How appropriate are these skills with your children?

13 (76%)	Very appropriate
3 (18%)	Appropriate
1 (6%)	Somewhat appropriate

In response to the question, as to how the skills list could be improved, the following comments were made:

- the list could be shorter
- more skills in the science area are needed
- we need more difficult skills for the brighter child
- we need to break down skills to a greater degree
- I like the fact that the most important ones are marked

As a result of teacher comments, the skills list was revised to contain a list of extending skills for children who evidenced the need for more challenging activities. The curriculum guide was then prepared in draft form and evaluated by our auditor in early education and the project director as to the content, organization and usefulness of such a guide. The auditor believed that the process used in creating the guide was in agreement with the project objective, for in each step of the process from the statement of philosophy to suggested activities, the work of the teaching staff is apparent.

The guide is now in printed form and accompanies this report.

The guide includes:

- Goals
- Characteristics of Three, Four and Five Year Old Children
- A statement of Assessment and Observation
- The Parent
- A Week at Home - A Day at School
- Language Skills and Concept Development
- Math and Science Development
- Motor Skills Development
- Extending Skills
- Personal and Social Adjustment
- Creative Arts
- Sequence Chart of Cognitive Development

In every way possible we have attempted to make the objectives meaningful by presenting interesting activities that meet the objective and emphasize the process of involvement, creativeness, manipulation, exploration and experimentation needed to make learning successful.

g. Process Objective One

Each Parent-Child Early Education teacher will attend at least two inservice sessions per month to learn how to:

A. Utilize appropriate motivational techniques for environmentally disadvantaged and handicapped pupils.

B. Accurately identify and work with pupils who have learning problems due to emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, physical handicaps, low intellectual functioning, and mental retardation.

Beginning August 27, 1973, a two week (20-hour per week) preservice training for teachers was held. Since there were only two new staff members, the inservice period was not as long as in previous project years. The staff development in these two weeks included: report of Evaluation Preceding Year II PCEE Program, overview of program goals and procedures, revision of the skills checklist, task analysis and writing of activity cards, speech development, observation and discussion of what is normal in behavior. Consultant Specialists, the Project Director, and other specialists in the program have assumed responsibility for providing teacher preservice and inservice training.

With the implementation of Saturday School on September 15, 1973, and Home Teaching, staff inservice has been given in weekly sessions held on Wednesday and Thursday.

Each Saturday School teacher attends a two hour session per week on one of these two days. Major inservice activities and the approximate per cent of time allotted to each are summarized as follows:

1) Identifying needs of children; discussing emotional problems and ways to modify behavior and appropriate teaching techniques for different kinds of learners - 50% of time.
2) Team planning of the instructional program for Saturday School and Home Teaching - 40% of time.
3) Formalized staff development activities led by Consultant Specialists in the program - 10% of time. Topics for discussion include analyzing a task, programming instruction, and developing oral language skills and motor skills.

At some staff development meetings, special topics have been discussed. Staff members have shared ideas on activities to be used on home teaching visits and also at Saturday School during two sessions. Two sessions were devoted to rating children on the Nursery School Adjustment Rating Scale, and four sessions have been devoted to gross and fine motor development and the use of the parachute in teaching concepts. Major emphasis this year, at the request of the staff, has been on motor development and activities. Members of the Child Development Team have been present to work with individual teaching teams on alternate sessions.

The team leaders from each of the six school centers met monthly with the Project Director and discussed needs of their team and provided direction to the total program. For example, we have discussed the content of home teaching visits, service by the specialists, testing procedures, varying the Saturday School Programs, etc.

Teacher attendance records show only the absence of one teacher during the preservice workshop. This was due to hospitalization.

Attendance of the teachers at weekly inservice sessions September, 1973 through June, 1974 is summarized as follows:

12 teachers (63%) had perfect attendance
5 teachers (26%) had one absence
1 teacher (5%) had three absences

One teacher was ill for the last several weeks and her position was filled by a substitute who attended inservice planning meetings.

As can be seen from the above summary, all teachers far exceeded attendance expectations. The Project Director is most pleased with the process developed by staff in the weekly inservice meetings, and this is reported in the monograph, Putting Together A Staff Development Program for Preschool Teachers.

The interaction between consultants and the teaching staff provides a strengthened program for the child and growth for the teacher in her role as a teacher and as a person. A regularly defined time for staff development in which various processes are allowed to develop results in tremendous growth to the teaching staff and to the total program.

h. Process Objective Two

Each kindergarten teacher will attend at least four inservice sessions during the first year of the project operation to learn how to:

A. Utilize appropriate motivational techniques for environmentally disadvantaged or handicapped pupils.

B. Accurately identify and work with pupils who have learning problems due to emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, physical handicaps, low intellectual functioning, and mental retardation.

This objective was met during the first two years of the project. However, a change in the inservice format for the school district this year necessitated different programming. This year, all district staff members had a choice of attending two short courses over an extended period of time. Subjects did not pertain to a specific age level. However, consultants from the PCEE Program are involved in two of these short term courses open to any elementary teacher in the school district.

On September 19, October 3, January 5, and January 16, Dr. Allen Yater led a workshop on Observing Children's Behavior. Twenty-nine teachers and principals were involved in this course.

A course entitled, Personality and Social Development was held in February and March by Dr. Sidney Kasper, psychologist on the PCEE staff, and two psychiatric social workers. The discussions centered on personality aspects (shyness, boldness, dependence, independence, socialization, and rebelliousness).

Direct staff development to kindergarten teachers has been offered in other ways. At the beginning of the school year, the two learning disabilities specialists observed every child who had indicated learning problems in the Saturday School program. At that time, the specialists and the teachers worked out programming for these children. In addition, special teachers funded under Title I have worked with Kindergarten and Beginning Primary children in six schools in the area of language and perceptual development. All school counselors were contacted by the Project Director concerning those children with emotional and behavioral problems whom we believed should be followed up and provided with continued support.

The Director of the Parent-Child Early Education Program is also in contact with kindergarten teachers and principals through regular visits and observations. She also attempts to work with some beginning primary teachers concerning program content and service to problem children. It should also be mentioned that a meeting of kindergarten teachers in one area of the school district was held November 6, 1973 to discuss the content of the home teaching visits at the kindergarten level. Following the PCEE model, most kindergarten teachers and many beginning primary teachers are making regular home visits. As follow-up, a record of parent assistance in the classroom is being kept.

Service to kindergarten and beginning primary teachers has been provided by three district curriculum consultants who serve elementary schools. These consultants also serve on the Home School/Kindergarten Curriculum Committee and have been most helpful in monitoring and providing leadership with kindergarten teachers.

Finally, it should be emphasized that there is an awareness of the necessity for a follow-up to the Saturday School Program, if the early school gains are to be maintained and if individual needs are to be met. The follow-up data on student achievement and adjustment at kindergarten and beginning primary levels points to our concern and interest.

i. Process Objective Three

> Each Parent-Child Early Education teacher will demonstrate appropriate teaching techniques (e.g., reinforcement methods) to parents during Saturday School. The Project Director will determine whether teachers are carrying on this activity through observations of teacher-parent interactions during the Saturday School classes.

Data were collected on items relating to this objective by the Project Director during Saturday School classes at the beginning and end of each of the three program years and during one midyear home visit. Principals also made ratings of teachers on these items during midyear home visits in the second and third project years. (See Appendix K.) Ratings made at Saturday School at the beginning and end of each project year were compared using paired observations t tests. A summary of these results is presented in Table 22.

Table 22

A Summary of Initial and Final Ratings of Teachers' Effectiveness in Demonstrating Appropriate Teaching Techniques to Parents

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
Demonstrated appropriate teaching techniques: effectively--ineffectively	First	25	Initial	3.64	.76	6.11	<.01	12	48
			Final	4.32	.69			3	12
	Second	24	Initial	3.17	.64	8.31	<.01	19	79
			Final	4.17	.64			3	12
	Third	17	Initial	4.00	.50	2.38	<.05	2	12
			Final	4.41	.51			0	0
Demonstrated positive motivation and reinforcement techniques: effectively--ineffectively	First	25	Initial	3.76	.72	6.12	<.01	9	36
			Final	4.44	.58			1	4
	Second	24	Initial	3.29	.62	7.43	<.01	17	71
			Final	4.29	.46			0	0
	Third	17	Initial	4.12	.33	2.06	<.05	0	0
			Final	4.41	.51			0	0

It can be seen that teachers were rated by the Project Director as being statistically significantly more effective in demonstrating appropriate teaching, motivation, and reinforcement techniques at the end of each project year as compared to their status at the beginning of the year. Concomitantly there were far fewer teachers judged to be deficient at the end of each year than at the beginning. At the end of the third program year, all teachers had reached the criterion set for them on both rating scales. That is, all teachers were rated by the Project Director as being above average in the effectiveness of their demonstrations to parents of appropriate pedagogical techniques.

j. Process Objective Four

> Each Parent-Child Early Education and kindergarten teacher will teach each other's classes at least once during the first year of the program so as to demonstrate the need for, and the ways in which to, coordinate the PCEE and kindergarten programs.

The purpose of this objective as stated is to coordinate the PCEE and the kindergarten programs. The objective was carred out during the first year of the project with an actual exchange of teaching positions. Since then, contact has been continued in other ways.

Teachers of the PCEE Program consider it part of their job to maintain contact with the home school, particularly the kindergarten teachers and principal. Instead of teaching each other's classes as was done during the first year of the program, Saturday School teachers visited a kindergarten classroom during November or December in order to observe both large and small group instruction. In most cases, PCEE teachers observed particular children who had been of concern to them. Some teachers were also pleased to see former parents helping in the kindergarten. Kindergarten teachers have also accompanied Saturday School teachers on home visits.

Regular contact was maintained with the principal, and some PCEE teachers made it a practice to visit at the school each week. Principals accompanied PCEE teachers on a home teaching visit and evaluated their performance. Fourteen of the seventeen elementary principals made a home teaching visit and did rate teacher performance.

This year, at one elementary school, the kindergarten and PCEE teachers provided a program once a week during the month of May for the PCEE children who would be attending that school in the fall. In working together, the PCEE teacher was able to show the kindergarten teacher individual strengths and weaknesses of the children, and together they were able to plan appropriate programs. The kindergarten teacher became acquainted with the children and the children easily adapted to their new school environment.

Also, at the conclusion of the school year, Saturday School teachers met with all kindergarten teachers and some principals to discuss each child in the PCEE Program and their general development and supply them with written information. This was done in order to provide a smooth transition into the next school year.

k. Process Objective Five

> Parent-Child Early Education teachers will work collaboratively with the Project Director in monthly meetings to develop weekly Home Activity Packets that complement the instruction given in Saturday School.

Since the Home Activity Guide this year is a revision of activities used last year in the program, teachers have not been so closely involved in providing activities. However, in response to the question on the Home Activity Guide, 92% of the teachers felt they were appropriate or very appropriate.

In a questionnaire to teachers during the middle of the third project year concerning ways of improving written teaching activities and tips to parents, these comments were made:

- I think the teaching activities are appropriate.
- The process of learning should be emphasized to parents.
- The Activity Guides are more organized and in a better sequence.
- The memo to parents is excellent and good for me as a teacher.
- We need more challenging activities for some of our children.
- Even more emphasis must be placed on positive reinforcement.
- More parents are using the Activity Guide this year.

- Sample drawings of activities are very helpful.
- I like the activities listed in sequence of difficulty.

Teachers were involved in the preparation of two holiday issues for Valentine's Day and Easter. Two additional guides were also developed with assistance from the staff dealing with new skills or providing opportunity for reinforcement of some skills.

In addition to the guides and at the request of teachers, two sources of learning activities were developed on the topics of Listening and Motor Development. The packets described the process of the skills and then provided activities in order to develop the skill.

We believe that the Home Activity Guide is now well developed. Any new materials that will be developed will provide alternatives for parent teaching activities.

1. Process Objective Six

> Parent-Child Early Education teachers will work collaboratively with the Project Director in monthly meetings to develop monthly planning charts and a curriculum guide.

This objective has been previously discussed under THE STAFF: Product Objective Six and Process Objective One.

The sequence chart of skills was revised at the beginning of the current school year and slightly revised during the spring of this year. A list of extending skills for capable children was also developed.

SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Parent ratings of both the PCEE Program and their children's teachers were collected at the end of the second and third project years. Parents (610 from the second year and 577 from the third year) responded to ten five-point scales evaluating different aspects of the program and parental perceptions of the teachers. The ten items, together with the N's and percentages for each point of the scales are given in Appendices L-1 and L-2 for the second and third years respectively.

Inspection of these appendices shows that the vast majority of parents (more than 98%) thought that the tasks presented to their children were interesting and met their educational needs, that the home visit was a good learning experience for both child and parent (more than 96%), and that as a result of participating in the program they felt better able to deal with their child both educationally and personally (95%). A somewhat smaller majority agreed with the statements that they would like to receive home visits when their children go to kindergarten (80%) and that as a result of their experience in teaching Saturday School they would like to assist in the kindergarten (about 75%). Looking at the scales dealing with their children's teachers, it may be seen that nearly all parents thought that their child's teacher seemed to be very interested in their child as an individual (99%), that the teacher prepared and explained the parents' lessons well to them when they taught at Saturday School (99%), and that their child's teacher liked the parents both as parents and people (98% or higher), that if they had another preschool child they would like him to be taught by the same teacher (96%), and that the teacher really got them interested in doing more with their children than they had done before (about 90%).

In sum, parents responded very positively to all aspects of the program and to their children's teachers on the items presented to them.

4. THE HANDICAPPED

a. Product Objective One, The Child

> Each child identified as learning disabled and who scores below average on social growth and independence as measured by the Inventory for Pre-School and Kindergarten Children at the beginning of the Parent-Child Early Education Program will increase his score by a minimum of two points by the time of exit from the Program.

The Yater-Barclay Inventory was administered to 18 of the 38 children in the first project year tentatively identified as learning disabled by the preliminary screening battery. National norms were not available for this test, therefore, identification of those children who were below average in social growth and independence was dependent upon the comparison of each score obtained with the mean and standard deviation of the distribution of scores by the pupils in this sample. Ordinarily, according to one of the scale's authors, pupils who score greater than two standard deviations below the mean are classified as "high risk;" those scoring between one and two standard deviations below the mean are classified as "vulnerable."

The mean total score obtained on the Inventory in the fall of 1971 was 18.44 with a standard deviation of 2.73. Using the classification scheme stated above, no pupil (0%) was classified as "high risk" and two pupils (11%) were classified as "vulnerable." Because of the small sample size and homogeneity of the sample, it was doubtful whether the measurement of attainment of this objective would be valid. Regression alone could easily account for a two point change. In addition, the Specialist for the Learning Disabled expressed her dissatisfaction with this instrument because of its lack of ceiling for this sample. For these reasons, plus a desire not to waste time in posttesting, no posttest was given in the spring. For these reasons, it was decided to use the Myklebust Pupil Maturity Scale during the second and third years of project operation.

The Myklebust Scale was administered as part of a further screening battery to those pupils in the second and third project years who were tentatively identified as learning disabled. Those pupils who were then diagnosed as being truly learning disabled were given special programs described elsewhere in this report and were again tested, six months later, at the end of each project year. A summary of the results obtained on the initial and final administrations of the Myklebust Scale is presented in Table 23. The norm data as supplied in the test manual is also given for reference.

Table 23
Results of Further Screening and Final Testing of Pupils Identified to be Learning Disabled on the Myklebust Maturity Scale

Variables	Sample		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Range of Scores
Auditory Comprehension	Norming			12.75	3.53			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	9.71	2.84	1.90	n.s.	5-16
		Post		11.00	1.89			9-15
	3rd Year	Pre	34	7.65	1.74	3.14	<.01	5-11
		Post		10.79	2.04			6-14
Spoken Language	Norming			15.89	3.80			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	12.24	2.84	3.31	<.01	9-16
		Post		15.12	2.52			12-20
	3rd Year	Pre	34	8.32	3.18	5.75	<.01	0-15
		Post		12.18	3.61			0-16
Orientation	Norming			13.35	3.03			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	9.88	1.78	3.13	<.01	8-14
		Post		11.76	2.17			8-15
	3rd Year	Pre	34	8.00	2.91	5.24	<.01	4-12
		Post		10.15	3.12			4-18
Motor Coordination	Norming			9.57	1.74			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	8.41	2.06	<1	n.s.	7-13
		Post		8.41	.90			8-10
	3rd Year	Pre	33	5.85	2.74	5.10	<.01	1-11
		Post		7.33	2.39			1-11
Personal-Social Behavior	Norming			26.31	6.09			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	19.82	3.91	<1	n.s.	15-27
		Post		20.65	4.14			15-26
	3rd Year	Pre	34	17.03	4.48	5.32	<.01	9-24
		Post		19.85	4.48			9-27
Total	Norming			77.86	16.19			
	2nd Year	Pre	17	60.06	6.10	3.74	<.01	53-71
		Post		66.94	6.99			54-77
	3rd Year	Pre	34	46.41	10.50	10.84	<.01	29-64
		Post		59.85	12.31			28-82

It can be seen that the pupils from both years tested on the Myklebust Scale scored considerably below the means reported for the norming group on all five subtests as well as on the total test at the time of the first administration. This was especially true of third project year pupils. Pupils from both years improved their scores in the areas of Spoken Language and Orientation as well as on the Total Test. Pupils from the third project year also showed statistically significant gains in the areas of Auditory Comprehension, Motor Coordination and Personal-Social Behavior. In general, those pupils who were identified as being learning disabled scored more like the norms reported on their second test administration than they did on their first administration but they had not yet succeeded in entirely closing the gap between their scores and those reported for the norming group.

If one uses the criterion of a minimum increase of two points in score for each child as set forth in the objective when the Yater-Barclay Inventory was used, then the following changes can be determined:

a) Auditory Comprehension - During the second project year six pupils (35%) of the 17 tested achieved this criterion whereas 26 pupils (76%) of the 34 third year pupils tested met or exceeded the criterion of a gain of two points.

b) Spoken Language - Eleven (65%) of the 17 pupils tested during the second project year met or exceeded the criterion whereas 26 (76%) of 34 pupils from the third project year did so.

c) Orientation - Eleven (65%) of the 17 pupils tested during the second program year met or exceeded the criterion of a two point gain. Twenty-one (62%) of the 34 pupils tested during the third year did so.

d) Motor Coordination - Four (24%) of the 17 pupils from the second program year and 16 (48%) of the 33 pupils from the third program year met or exceeded the criterion of a two point gain in scores.

e) Personal-Social Behavior - Eight (47%) of the 17 pupils from the second year and 22 (65%) of the 34 pupils from the third project year met or exceeded the criterion.

f) Total Test - Thirteen (76%) of the 17 pupils from the second project year and 32 (94%) of the 34 pupils from the third project year met or exceeded the criterion of a two point gain on their final test scores.

Thus between 24% and 76% of the second project year pupils and between 48% and 94% of the third project year pupils achieved the criterion of a minimum two-point gain between the two administrations of the Myklebust Scale. While this falls considerably below 100% achievement of this criterion, it should be noted that the criterion was much more closely approximated in the final year of project operation than had been the case in the preceding year.

b. Product Objective Two, The Child

> Each child identified as learning disabled will show a minimum of four months gain for each three months in the program, in perceptual, physical motor, and language development as measured by such tests as Development Test of Visual-Motor Integration and Oseretsky Motor Proficiency Test, ITPA, and PPVT.

During each of the three project years all pupils suspected of having learning disabilities were further tested with a battery which included the Beery Visual Motor Integration Test and the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test. During the first two program years the battery also included the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the Oseretsky Motor Proficiency Test and the Sievers Differential Language Facility Test. During the final program year the ITPA was substituted for these latter three tests. It was felt that this test would enable us to determine the processing kinds of skills of reception, comprehension and expression as well as the modality strengths and weaknesses of individuals. Essentially, this one instrument would provide much information in an organized manner.

Those pupils diagnosed to be truly learning disabled by the Consultant Specialist were given special programs and retested using the same diagnostic battery at the end of each project year (six months later). A summary of the results of these tests is given in Table 24. (For frequency distributions of the results of each test, refer to Appendix M.)

Table 24

Results of Further Screening and Final Testing of Pupils Identified as Being Learning Disabled

Name of Test	Project Year		N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Range of Scores
Beery	1st	Pre	18	50.33	8.85	5.78	<.01	33-66
		Post	18	61.77	12.67			36-86
	2nd	Pre	18	41.78	8.04	8.10	<.01	34-57
		Post	18	60.50	5.75			49-72
	3rd	Pre	25	45.40	9.81	6.55	<.01	33-72
		Post	25	57.00	7.60			38-66
Goodenough-Harris	1st	Pre	17	75.47	9.87	3.64	<.01	58-92
		Post	17	93.82	16.24			70-137
	2nd	Pre	17	82.71	14.92	2.62	<.02	62-113
		Post	17	92.12	9.23			77-113
	3rd	Pre	24	76.92	12.88	3.27	<.01	55-96
		Post	24	86.38	11.80			59-111
Peabody	1st	Pre	18	58.11	13.73	4.38	<.01	38-94
		Post	18	76.72	15.27			39-101
	2nd	Pre	18	58.89	9.11	5.97	<.01	44-76
		Post	18	70.83	10.99			55-94
Oseretsky	1st	Pre	13	59.54	7.83	7.59	<.01	47-75
		Post	13	79.77	7.11			68-91
	2nd	Pre	17	62.12	7.32	3.79	<.01	52-79
		Post	17	70.62	5.78			64-88
Sievers	1st	Pre	18	46.39	6.97	12.26	<.01	35-56
		Post	18	74.72	9.22			41-79
	2nd	Pre	16	61.28	11.20	6.65	<.01	46-79
		Post	16	78.17	2.18			72-79

(continued)

Table 24 (continued)

Name of Test	Project Year		N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Range of Scores
ITPA								
Auditory Recognition	3rd	Pre	24	49.92	7.01	2.79	<.02	35-64
		Post	24	57.79	11.95			42-103
Visual Recognition	3rd	Pre	24	55.83	12.20	7.04	<.01	25-75
		Post	24	69.92	9.46			55-93
Auditory Association	3rd	Pre	24	51.08	8.28	4.54	<.01	36-68
		Post	24	57.25	7.18			43-65
Visual Association	3rd	Pre	24	51.17	13.01	4.25	<.01	28-91
		Post	24	62.17	8.75			38-75
Verbal Expression	3rd	Pre	24	48.71	11.72	9.21	<.01	24-76
		Post	24	68.79	11.34			40-94
Motor Expression	3rd	Pre	24	55.08	16.39	6.00	<.01	24-86
		Post	24	78.29	20.03			42-110
Auditory Closure	3rd	Pre	24	46.62	9.73	6.03	<.01	26-66
		Post	24	56.75	6.69			43-66

(continued)

Table 24 (continued)

Name of Test	Project Year		N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Range of Scores
ITPA								
Visual Closure	3rd	Pre	24	52.71	13.96	11.50	<.01	26-90
		Post	24	64.21	15.46			35-105
Auditory Memory	3rd	Pre	24	42.46	9.58	8.58	<.01	26-66
		Post	24	51.04	15.06			26-91
Visual Memory	3rd	Pre	24	54.46	16.12	12.79	<.01	34-94
		Post	24	67.25	17.62			46-125
Total (PLA)	3rd	Pre	24	50.58	7.32	12.04	<.01	33-65
		Post	24	62.62	7.10			47-76

*Results of tests are given in months with the exception of Goodenough-Harris which yields a standard score with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

The results of the comparisons made between the two administrations of the tests showed that learning disabled pupils had statistically significantly higher mean scores on all tests at the end of each of the program years than they had had at the beginning.

The major goal for the six month period between test administrations was an eight month gain in test scores on those tests which yielded age norms. The results were as follows:

Perceptual Age - An average gain of 11 months was made during the six months between administrations of the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration during the first project year. Average gains of 19 months and 11 months were made during the second and third project years respectively. Sixty-one percent of first year pupils, 83% of second year pupils, and 68% of third year pupils met or exceeded the criterion of an eight month gain in perceptual age.

Mental Age - an average gain of 18 months was made during the six months between administrations of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test during the first project year. An average gain of 12 months was made during the second year. Of all learning disabled pupils in both project years, two-thirds attained or exceeded the goal of an eight month gain in mental age.

Language Age - An average gain of 28 months was made during the six months between administrations of the Sievers Differential Language Facility Test during the first project year. An average gain of 17 months was made during the second year. Over 91% of all learning disabled pupils from both project years met or exceeded the goal of an eight month gain in language age.

Motor Age - Average gains of 20 and 8.5 months were made on the Oseretsky Motor Proficiency Test during the first and second project years, respectively. More than 75% of all learning disabled pupils from both project years met or exceeded the goal of an eight month gain in motor age.

Perceptual-Language Age - as measured by the ITPA. Between 38% and 92% of the third project year pupils met or exceeded the eight month gain on the various 10 subtests of the ITPA. On the total test scores, 58% met or exceeded the goal set for them.

Goodenough-Harris - Because the norms of this test are expressed in standard scores with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 points, rather than in age units, a reasonable expectation of gain for these pupils was agreed upon to be one-third of a standard deviation, or five points. All pupils (100%) in the first project year exceeded this criterion, 65% of the second year pupils did so, and 54% of the third year pupils increased their scores by more than five points.

In most instances the vast majority of pupils from the three project years identified as learning disabled met the criteria set for them. That is, they gained at least eight months in test scores during the six months between test administrations.

c. Product Objective Three, The Child

> Each PCEE child identified as emotionally disturbed, who was rated by his parent as showing above average symptomology on the items of the Glidewell Scale incorporated into the Behavior Checklist, "My Preschool Child," at the time of entry into the PCEE Program, will show, by the time of entry into kindergarten, a decrease of a minimum of one step on at least twenty-five percent of the three-point scales in which the symptoms were rated as occurring "often."

Comparisons were made between parents' ratings of their child's symptomology at the time of entry into the first and second PCEE Program years and at the time of entry into kindergarten on the 16 items of the Glidewell Scale. The results of these comparisons are given in Table 25 and include the means, standard deviations, and paired observations *t* test findings for each item.

Table 25

Summary of Results Comparing Parents' Ratings of the Glidewell Items for PCEE Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems at the Time of Entry Into the PCEE Program and Upon Entry Into Kindergarten*

Child has trouble with:	Project Year		Mean**	Standard Deviation	t	p	Proportion Rated Above Average Symptomology*** N	%
1. Eating (too much or too little)	First	PCEE	.90	.72	-5.22	<.01	161	68
		Kdg.	.62	.65			120	54
	Second	PCEE	.78	.65	-4.80	<.01	89	65
		KDG.	.51	.66			57	42
2. Sleeping (too much or too little)	First	PCEE	.46	.62	-4.74	<.01	92	39
		Kdg.	.26	.49			52	24
	Second	PCEE	.48	.63	-3.06	<.01	54	41
		Kdg.	.29	.52			35	26
3. Stomach Irregularities	First	PCEE	.29	.50	<1	n.s.	64	27
		Kdg.	.27	.48			56	25
	Second	PCEE	.36	.54	-1.87	n.s.	44	33
		Kdg.	.27	.48			34	26
4. Getting along with children	First	PCEE	1.09	.70	-6.39	<.01	187	79
		Kdg.	.70	.69			130	59
	Second	PCEE	.98	.65	-3.01	<.01	105	78
		Kdg.	.74	.63			86	64
5. Getting along with adults	First	PCEE	1.00	.77	-7.46	<.01	165	70
		Kdg.	.53	.76			89	40
	Second	PCEE	.92	.73	-4.39	<.01	92	71
		Kdg.	.56	.71			58	44
6. Unusual fears	First	PCEE	.61	.62	-4.79	<.01	127	54
		Kdg.	.36	.65			71	32
	Second	PCEE	.56	.60	-4.47	<.01	67	50
		Kdg.	.29	.49			36	27
7. Nervousness	First	PCEE	.45	.55	-2.23	<.05	100	42
		Kdg.	.36	.53			73	33
	Second	PCEE	.57	.65	-2.14	<.05	64	48
		Kdg.	.44	.59			52	39
8. Thumbsucking	First	PCEE	.50	.81	-3.11	<.01	69	29
		Kdg.	.40	.73			56	25
	Second	PCEE	.55	.87	-4.19	<.01	40	30
		Kdg.	.37	.68			35	26

(continued)

Table 25 (continued)

Child has trouble with:	Project Year		Mean**	Standard Deviation	t	p	Proportion Rated Above Average Symptomology***	
							N	%
9. Overactivity	First	PCEE	.68	.74	-5.50	<.01	121	51
		Kdg.	.43	.63			81	36
	Second	PCEE	.73	.79	-4.30	<.01	70	52
		Kdg.	.47	.68			49	37
10. Daydreaming	First	PCEE	.45	.53	-2.42	<.05	105	44
		Kdg.	.36	.51			78	35
	Second	PCEE	.39	.51	-1.63	n.s.	51	38
		Kdg.	.32	.48			41	31
11. Temper Tantrums	First	PCEE	.86	.56	-5.88	<.01	176	74
		Kdg.	.62	.56			151	68
	Second	PCEE	.87	.62	-5.36	<.01	100	74
		Kdg.	.56	.55			64	47
12. Crying	First	PCEE	.96	.58	-4.36	<.01	198	84
		Kdg.	.79	.57			160	71
	Second	PCEE	.88	.60	-2.75	<.01	101	75
		Kdg.	.72	.53			92	69
13. Lying	First	PCEE	.62	.53	-2.94	<.01	140	59
		Kdg.	.51	.54			110	49
	Second	PCEE	.59	.52	<1	n.s.	77	57
		Kdg.	.56	.56			71	53
14. Tearing or breaking things	First	PCEE	.62	.52	-7.94	<.01	140	59
		Kdg.	.31	.47			68	30
	Second	PCEE	.54	.58	-3.56	<.01	67	50
		Kdg.	.35	.51			46	34
15. Wetting	First	PCEE	.55	.73	-4.23	<.01	96	40
		Kdg.	.37	.64			63	28
	Second	PCEE	.76	.58	-4.95	<.01	63	47
		Kdg.	.64	.35			40	30
16. Speech	First	PCEE	.54	.69	-7.81	<.01	98	41
		Kdg.	.23	.53			41	18
	Second	PCEE	.56	.70	-4.17	<.01	58	44
		Kdg.	.29	.56			32	24

*There were 223 emotionally handicapped pupils rated twice by their parents from the first project year and 136 from the second project year.

**Scores represent a continuum from 0 - 2, with 0 being the positive end of the scale.

***Above average symptomology was defined as a rating from "1" or "2" on each three-point scale.

It may be seen in the table that PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems were rated by their parents as having significantly lower symptomology upon entry into kindergarten than had been the case upon entry into the PCEE Program one year earlier. On at least 13 of the 16 three-point scales the means were statistically significantly lower upon entry into kindergarten and there were also fewer pupils rated as displaying above average symptomology (defined as a rating of "1" or "2" on each three-point scale) than had been the case upon entry into the four-year-old program.

The evaluation criterion **set for** pupils identified as having emotional problems was that each of these pupils would improve his rating by at least one step on 25% of the items on which he had been judged to have above average symptomology initially. Analyses of these changes were made for those pupils in both project years and summaries are given below by year.

a) First Project Year - Of the 220 pupils rated twice on the Glidewell items, six (3%) showed no changes in their ratings; 27 (12%) changed in a positive direction on some items but not enough to reach the criterion of 25% of the items; five (3%) met the criterion exactly; and, 182 (82%) exceeded the criterion set for them. Of these 182 pupils who had exceeded the criterion, 77 were rated more positively on between 26% and 50% of the items, 64 attained lower ratings on 51% to 75% of those items, and 41 decreased their ratings on 76% to 100% of the scales on which they were initially judged to have above average symptomology. Altogether, 187 (85%) of the 220 PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems during the first project year met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 133 pupils rated twice, 6 (5%) showed no changes in their ratings; 14 (11%) changed in a positive direction on some items, but not enough to reach the criterion of 25% of the items; 6 (5%) met the criterion exactly; and 107 (80%) exceeded the criterion set for them. Of these 107 pupils who exceeded the criterion, 46 were rated more positively on between 26% and 50% of the items, 33 attained lower ratings on 51% to 75% of the items, and 28 decreased their ratings on 76% to 100% of the scales on which they were initially judged to have above average symptomology. Altogether, 113 (85%) of the 133 PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems during the second project year met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

The results obtained from the first two project years are very similar. In neither year was the goal of

100% attainment of the criterion met, but it seems to have been well approximated.

Additional analyses were calculated comparing the ratings of PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems to PCEE pupils identified as having no emotional problems on the Glidewell items both prior to entry into the PCEE Program and prior to entry into kindergarten for both project years. A summary of the results of these comparisons may be found in Table 26. (The items, together with *N*'s and percentages for each group, are given in Appendix D.)

TABLE 26

Summary of Results Comparing Parents' Ratings of the Glidewell Items
for PCEE Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems and
PCEE Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems
at the Time of Entry Into Kindergarten for
First and Second Project Year Pupils

Child has trouble with:	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology N	%
1. **Eating** (too much or too little)	First	Initial	ED	287	.86	.73	28.15	< .005	188	66
			Not ED	509	.60	.62			266	52
		Final	ED	223	.63	.65	3.43	n.s.	120	54
			Not ED	356	.53	.66			156	44
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.80	.67	9.55	< .005	155	67
			Not ED	464	.64	.66			247	53
		Final	ED	138	.49	.65	< 1	n.s.	57	42
			Not ED	299	.46	.62			121	40
2. **Sleeping** (too much or too little)	First	Initial	ED	287	.45	.60	108.88	< .005	112	39
			Not ED	509	.21	.45			100	20
		Final	ED	220	.26	.49	6.05	< .025	52	24
			Not ED	352	.16	.42			52	15
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.48	.64	55.83	< .005	94	40
			Not ED	464	.19	.40			85	18
		Final	ED	135	.28	.52	10.87	< .005	35	26
			Not ED	299	.15	.39			41	14
3. Stomach irregularities	First	Initial	ED	287	.29	.50	87.11	< .005	75	26
			Not ED	509	.15	.36			74	15
		Final	ED	225	.24	.48	8.81	< .005	56	25
			Not ED	356	.14	.36			50	14
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.28	.50	14.80	< .005	60	26
			Not ED	464	.15	.38			65	14
		Final	ED	135	.26	.47	10.23	< .005	34	26
			Not ED	300	.14	.36			44	15

(continued)

TABLE 26 (continued)

Child has trouble with:	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology N	%
4. **Getting along with children**	First	Initial	ED	287	1.07	.69	34.49	<.005	227	79
			Not ED	509	.70	.66			299	59
		Final	ED	222	.68	.69	8.59	<.005	130	59
			Not ED	355	.52	.65			154	43
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.99	.64	92.84	<.005	185	79
			Not ED	464	.53	.58			223	48
		Final	ED	137	.74	.65	8.65	<.005	86	64
			Not ED	299	.55	.67			136	45
5. **Getting along with adults**	First	Initial	ED	287	.98	.78	96.33	<.005	195	68
			Not ED	509	.45	.69			172	34
		Final	ED	220	.53	.76	2.07	n.s.	89	40
			Not ED	355	.35	.64			91	26
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.88	.73	118.32	<.005	155	67
			Not ED	464	.33	.57			131	28
		Final	ED	135	.58	.72	11.13	<.005	58	44
			Not ED	300	.36	.66			78	26
6. **Unusual fears**	First	Initial	ED	287	.61	.62	67.32	<.005	154	54
			Not ED	509	.29	.46			147	29
		Final	ED	224	.35	.65	13.32	<.005	71	32
			Not ED	356	.20	.42			69	19
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.56	.62	28.32	<.005	115	49
			Not ED	464	.33	.51			143	31
		Final	ED	135	.28	.48	2.38	n.s.	36	27
			Not ED	298	.21	.45			59	20

(continued)

TABLE 26 (continued)

Child has trouble with:	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology N	%
7. Nervousness	First	Initial	ED	287	.48	.59	38.64	< .005	125	44
			Not ED	509	.25	.45			120	24
		Final	ED	223	.35	.53	15.10	< .005	73	33
			Not ED	356	.20	.41			71	20
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.54	.66	61.90	< .005	103	44
			Not ED	464	.21	.42			98	21
		Final	ED	136	.42	.58	19.81	< .005	52	39
			Not ED	299	.21	.45			61	20
8. Thumb-sucking	First	Initial	ED	287	.49	.80	16.31	< .005	84	29
			Not ED	509	.28=	.63			94	18
		Final	ED	223	.39	.73	15.89	< .005	56	25
			Not ED	357	.19	.51			49	14
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.49	.82	18.72	< .005	65	28
			Not ED	464	.25	.60			77	17
		Final	ED	136	.37	.68	12.27	< .005	35	26
			Not ED	299	.18	.49			41	14
9. Over-activity	First	Initial	ED	287	.65	.71	25.00	< .005	146	51
			Not ED	509	.41	.60			178	35
		Final	ED	224	.43	.63	74.85	< .005	81	36
			Not ED	354	.23	.46			77	22
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.69	.75	76.19	< .005	119	51
			Not ED	464	.28	.48			121	26
		Final	ED	136	.46	.68	13.32	< .005	49	37
			Not ED	298	.26	.52			62	21

(continued)

TABLE 26 (continued)

Child has trouble with:	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology	
									N	%
10. Day-dreaming	First	Initial	ED	287	.47	.55	29.22	< .005	127	44
			Not ED	509	.27	.46			135	27
		Final	ED	224	.36	.51	17.80	< .005	78	35
			Not ED	354	.20	.40			71	20
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.41	.53	15.16	< .005	90	39
			Not ED	464	.26	.46			115	25
		Final	ED	138	.30	.48	7.19	< .005	41	31
			Not ED	299	.19	.42			55	19
11. Temper tantrums	First	Initial	ED	287	.85	.57	76.56	< .005	215	75
			Not ED	509	.50	.52			250	49
		Final	ED	223	.62	.56	44.74	< .005	151	68
			Not ED	358	.33	.50			112	31
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.86	.60	72.21	< .005	173	74
			Not ED	464	.48	.52			220	47
		Final	ED	138	.55	.55	19.19	< .005	64	47
			Not ED	299	.33	.50			95	32
12. Crying		Initial	ED	287	.95	.54	49.00	< .005	238	83
			Not ED	509	.67	.53			326	64
		Final	ED	225	.79	.57	28.03	< .005	160	71
			Not ED	358	.54	.56			181	51
		Initial	ED	233	.92	.59	51.61	< .005	183	79
			Not ED	464	.60	.54			267	68
		Final	ED	138	.71	.54	12.70	< .005	92	69
			Not ED	299	.52	.55			149	50

(continued)

TABLE 26 (continued)

Child has trouble with:	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology N	%
13. Lying	First	Initial	ED	287	.61	.54	26.30	< .005	168	59
			Not ED	509	.41	.52			201	39
		Final	ED	223	.51	.54	8.85	< .005	110	49
			Not ED	356	.38	.50			132	37
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.57	.55	23.32	< .005	126	54
			Not ED	464	.37	.49			169	36
		Final	ED	138	.53	.55	21.44	< .005	71	53
			Not ED	299	.31	.47			89	30
14. **Tearing** or breaking things	First	Initial	ED	287	.62	.53	65.74	< .005	170	59
			Not ED	509	.32	.48			158	31
		Final	ED	223	.31	.47	19.35	< .005	68	30
			Not ED	356	.15	.36			55	15
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.55	.57	38.89	< .005	120	52
			Not ED	464	.30	.47			136	29
		Final	ED	138	.34	.52	25.56	< .005	46	34
			Not ED	299	.14	.37			44	15
15. Wetting	First	Initial	ED	288	.50	.72	39.43	< .005	107	37
			Not ED	509	.23	.49			99	19
		Final	ED	224	.37	.64	39.00	< .005	63	28
			Not ED	356	.11	.36			34	10
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.58	.75	72.33	< .005	99	42
			Not ED	463	.20	.43			88	19
		Final	ED	138	.33	.56	18.68	< .005	40	30
			Not ED	299	.15	.39			46	15

(continued)

TABLE 26 (continued)

Child has trouble with	Year		Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Proportion rated having above average symptomology	
									N	%
16. Speech	First	Initial	ED	288	.50	.68	7.65	< .01	115	40
			Not ED	509	.37	.61			155	30
		Final	ED	224	.22	.53	<1	n.s.	41	18
			Not ED	352	.23	.53			41	18
	Second	Initial	ED	233	.62	.75	32.61	<.005	107	46
			Not ED	464	.32	.60			115	25
		Final	ED	138	.34	.60	9.19	< .005	32	24
			Not ED	299	.19	.47			45	15

It may be seen in Table 26 that initial ratings on all 16 items, for both project years, for the PCEE pupils who were identified as not having emotional problems were statistically significantly lower than for PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems. On their final ratings, one year later, PCEE pupils without emotional problems were rated as displaying less symptomology on 14 of the 16 scales than PCEE pupils with emotional problems. These findings may be inferred from both the statistically significant *F* tests and the lower proportions of pupils with no emotional problems judged to have above average symptomology.

In summary, it was found that PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems substantially improved in the areas of interpersonal problems, psychophysical symptoms, and behaviors as assessed by their parents from the time of entry into the PCEE Program to the time of entry into kindergarten one year later. Their improvement, however, was not great enough to match the ratings of PCEE pupils identified as having no emotional problems.

d. Product Objective Four, The Child

> Each PCEE pupil identified as emotionally disturbed, who was found to be deficient on teacher ratings of the items of the Nursery School Adjustment Scale at the beginning of the PCEE Program, will show an increase of a minimum of one step on each five-point scale at the end of his first year in the program.

Pupils suspected of having emotional problems on the basis of an analysis of parent ratings on the Glidewell items were rated by their teachers on the items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" at the beginning of each project year to provide an additional method of detection. Pupils who were then identified as having emotional problems were again rated on the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" at the end of each project year. The *N*'s and percentages obtained at the beginning and end of each year by this group, as well as by the total sample, a sub-sample of pupils identified as having no handicaps of any kind, and a sub-sample of all handicapped pupils is presented in Appendix N. A summary of the comparisons between initial and final ratings received by pupils identified as having emotional problems is given in Table 27.

Table 27

Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" for Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems

	Project Year		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient*	
								N	%
1. Relationships with peers in Nursery School	First	Initial	241	3.06	1.06	7.91	<.01	68	28
		Final		3.63	1.13			36	15
	Second	Initial	214	3.19	1.16	9.26	<.01	58	27
		Final		3.79	1.02			24	11
	Third	Initial	233	2.78	.96	7.13	<.01	78	33
		Final		3.26	1.03			46	20
2. Relationships with Nursery School teachers	First	Initial	241	3.24	1.09	6.99	<.01	53	22
		Final		3.71	1.00			30	12
	Second	Initial	214	3.29	1.23	8.18	<.01	59	28
		Final		3.89	.98			19	9
	Third	Initial	233	2.89	.94	5.76	<.01	79	34
		Final		3.28	.99			47	20
3. Creative use of individual activities	First	Initial	241	3.38	1.00	10.51	<.01	39	16
		Final		4.09	.90			9	4
	Second	Initial	214	3.47	1.06	6.51	<.01	30	14
		Final		3.89	.99			12	6
	Third	Initial	233	3.20	.90	5.90	<.01	42	18
		Final		3.60	.84			19	8

(continued)

Table 27 (continued)

	Project Year		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient* N	Deficient* %
4. Signs of behavioral immaturity	First	Initial	241	3.41	1.11	7.15	<.01	46	19
		Final		3.90	.93			16	7
	Second	Initial	214	3.25	1.16	6.08	<.01	62	29
		Final		3.74	1.09			30	14
	Third	Initial	233	3.01	1.10	6.38	<.01	70	30
		Final		3.45	.98			33	14
5. Signs of behavioral eccentricity	First	Initial	241	3.56	1.10	3.65	<.01	37	15
		Final		3.80	1.02			28	12
	Second	Initial	214	3.27	1.24	5.45	<.01	65	30
		Final		3.66	1.03			34	16
	Third	Initial	233	3.13	1.12	4.43	<.01	74	32
		Final		3.42	.92			32	14

*Deficiency was defined as a rating of "2" or less on each five-point scale with "5" designated as the positive end of each scale.

It can be seen in the table that pupils were rated at the end of each project year as having improved their relationships with both their peers and their teachers, being more creative in their use of individual activities, and showing fewer signs of behavioral immaturity and eccentricity compared to their ratings at the beginning of each project year. These findings may be inferred from both the statistically significant paired observations t test results and the differences in the proportions of pupils found to be deficient on the scales at the beginning and end of each project year.

Analyses of individual changes for those pupils judged to be initially deficient on the five-point scales are given below for the three project years.

1) Relationships with peers

a) First Project Year - Of the 68 pupils rated as deficient (rated as "two" or less on this five-point scale) at the beginning of the program year, 26 (38%) gained one step, 18 (26%) gained two steps, and 7 (10%) gained three or more steps in the end of the year ratings. Altogether, 51 (75%) of those pupils rated as initially deficient in their relationships with peers increased one or more steps in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 58 pupils rated as deficient (rated as "two" or less on this five-point scale) at the beginning of the second program year, 24 (41%) gained one step, 17 (29%) gained two steps, and four (7%) gained three or more steps in their end of the year ratings. Altogether, 45 (78%) of those pupils rated as initially deficient in their relationships with peers increased one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 78 pupils initially judged to be deficient in their relationships with their peers, 24 (31%) gained one step, 21 (27%) gained two steps, and five (6%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 50 (64%) of the 78 pupils found to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain.

2) Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

a) First Project Year - Of the 53 pupils initially judged to be deficient in their relationships with their teachers, 17 (32%) gained one step, 18 (34%) gained two steps, and 7 (13%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 42 (79%) of those pupils rated by their teachers as being deficient in this trait at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in their end of the year ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 59 pupils initially judged to be deficient in their relationships with their teachers, 28 (47%) gained one step, 15 (25%) gained two steps, and nine (15%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 52 (88%) of those pupils rated by their teachers as being deficient in this trait at the beginning of the second program year gained one or more steps in their end of the year ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 79 pupils judged to be initially deficient in their relationships with their teachers. 33 (42%) gained one step, 16 (20%) gained two steps, and three (4%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In total, 52 (66%) of the 79 pupils initially found to be deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

3) Creative Use of Individual Activities

a) First Project Year - Of the 39 pupils rated as "two" or less on this trait at the beginning of the program year, 15 (38%) gained one step, 13 (33%) gained two steps, and 9 (23%) gained three or more steps in their ratings at the end of the program year. In sum, 37 (95%) of the pupils initially judged to be deficient in their creative use of individual activities gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 30 pupils initially rated as "two" or less on this five-point scale, 12 (40%) gained one step, six 20% gained two steps, and six (20%) gained three or more steps in their ratings at the end of the second program year. Altogether, 24 (80%) of the pupils initially judged to be deficient in their creative use of individual activities gained one or more steps in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 42 pupils judged to be initially deficient in their creative use of individual activities, 16 (38%) gained one step, 15 (36%) gained two steps, and three (7%) gained three steps in their final ratings. In sum, 34 (81%) of the 42 pupils initially found to be deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion.

4) Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

a) First Project Year - Of the 42 pupils initially judged to be deficient on this trait, 15 (33%) gained one step, 23 (50%) gained two steps, and 4 (9%) gained three or more steps. Altogether, 42 (91%) of the pupils judged to show many signs of behavioral immaturity at the beginning of the program year improved in their ratings by at least one step at the end of the year.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 62 pupils initially judged to be deficient in this trait, 22 (35%) gained one step, 12 (19%) gained two steps, and 11 (18%)

gained three or more steps. In total, 45 (73%) of those pupils judged to show many signs of behavioral immaturity at the beginning of the program year improved in their ratings by at least one step at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 70 pupils judged to be initially deficient in this trait, 32 (46%) gained one step, 17 (24%) gained two steps, and six (9%) gained three steps in their final ratings. In total, 55 (79%) of the 70 pupils found to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

5) Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

a) First Project Year - Of the 37 pupils initially rated as deficient on this trait, 16 (43%) gained one step, 10 (27%) gained two steps, and 3 (8%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 29 (78%) of those pupils judged to show many signs of behavioral eccentricity at the beginning of the program year improved in their ratings by at least one step in their end of the year ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 65 pupils initially rated as deficient in this trait, 28 (43%) gained one step, 15 (23%) gained two steps, and five (8%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 48 (74%) of those pupils judged to show many signs of behavioral eccentricity at the beginning of the program year improved in their ratings by at least one step at the end of the year.

c) Third Project Year - Of the 74 pupils initially rated as being deficient on this five-point scale, 40 (54%) gained one step, 14 (19%) gained two steps, and three (4%) gained three steps in their final ratings. In total, 57 (77%) of the 74 judged to be initially deficient in this trait met or exceeded the criterion set for them of a one-step gain.

In general, more than 70% of those pupils judged by their teachers to be initially deficient on the five items of the Nursery School Adjustment Scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their final ratings. These pupils had improved sufficiently so that by the end of each project year 80% or more were rated as being average or above average on each of the five scales.

Additional Analyses

1) Follow-up Into Kindergarten - Pupils identified as emotionally handicapped during the first two project years were followed up into kindergarten where they received ratings on the five items from their kindergarten teachers. A summary of the results for these

Table 28

A Summary of Initial, Final and Kindergarten Teacher Ratings on Items of the Nursery and Kindergarten School Adjustment Scales for First and Second Year Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems During the PCEE Program Years

Item	Project Year		Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
1. Relationships with Peers	First	Initial	3.06	1.06			68	28
		Final	3.63	1.13	7.91	<.01	36	15
		Follow-up	3.86	.97	2.34	<.05	19	8
	Second	Initial	3.19	1.16			58	27
		Final	3.79	1.02	9.26	<.01	24	11
		Follow-up	3.81	1.01	<1	n.s.	17	10
2. Relationships with Teachers	First	Initial	3.24	1.09			53	22
		Final	3.71	1.00	6.99	<.01	30	12
		Follow-up	3.80	1.02	1.09	n.s.	20	8
	Second	Initial	3.29	1.23			59	28
		Final	3.89	.98	8.18	<.01	19	9
		Follow-up	3.95	1.00	<1	n.s.	14	8
3. Creative Use of Individual Activities	First	Initial	3.38	1.00			39	16
		Final	4.09	.90	10.51	<.01	9	4
		Follow-up	3.90	.92	-2.01	<.05	14	6
	Second	Initial	3.47	1.06			30	14
		Final	3.89	.99	6.51	<.01	12	6
		Follow-up	3.67	1.11	<-2.27	<.05	21	11

(continued)

Table 28 (continued)

Item	Project Year		Mean*	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity	First	Initial	3.41	1.11			46	19
		Final	3.90	.93	7.15	<.01	16	7
		Follow-up	3.92	1.06	<.1	n.s.	31	13
	Second	Initial	3.25	1.16			62	29
		Final	3.74	1.09	6.08	<.01	30	14
		Follow-up	4.07	1.03	15.46	<.01	14	8
5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity	First	Initial	3.56	1.10			37	15
		Final	3.80	1.02	3.65	<.01	28	12
		Follow-up	3.94	1.04	1.62	n.s.	24	10
	Second	Initial	3.27	1.24			65	30
		Final	3.66	1.03	5.45	<.01	34	16
		Follow-up	3.96	1.07	13.60	<.01	18	10

*It should be noted that the higher number represents the positive end of the continuum represented by each scale.

pupils at the three times of rating (beginning and end of the PCEE year and during the kindergarten year) is given in Table 28.

It may be seen that at the end of each PCEE Program year pupils identified as having emotional problems were rated by their PCEE Program teachers as having improved relationships with both their peers and their teachers; being more creative in their use of individual activities; and, showing fewer signs of behavioral immaturity and eccentricity as compared with their initial ratings. At the time of entry into kindergarten, these pupils generally maintained the gains they had made upon exit from the program in the areas of relationships with teachers and showing signs of behavioral immaturity and eccentricity. In the area of relationships with peers, the first year pupils were rated somewhat higher by their kindergarten teachers than they had been at the end of the PCEE Program Year, second year pupils were rated more positively in their showing of signs of behavioral immaturity and eccentricity, and in the area concerning creative use of individual activities pupils from both project years were rated somewhat lower. These findings may be inferred from both the paired observation t test results with the attendant means and the differences in the proportions of pupils found to be deficient in the items at the three rating times.

2) Comparisons with Non-Emotionally Handicapped Pupils - First and second year PCEE pupils with emotional problems were compared to their non-emotionally handicapped counterparts at the beginning and end of the PCEE Program year and during kindergarten on five items of the Adjustment Scale. In addition, first project year pupils were rated on these five items during the first grade. Third project year pupils were compared at the beginning and end of the PCEE year. A summary of the results of these comparisons is given in Table 29.

TABLE 29

Comparisons of Teachers' Ratings on Items of the School Adjustment Scale at the Times of Entry Into and Exit From the PCEE Program During All Three Years of Project Operation and Upon Entry Into Kindergarten and First Grade Between Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems and Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems

Item	Year		Sample	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
1. Relationships with Peers	First	Initial	ED	242	3.06	1.06	9[illegible]	<.005
			Not ED	549	3.78	.90		
		Final	ED	242	3.63	1.13	41.43	<.005
			Not ED	515	4.14	.96		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	239	3.86	.97	12.38	<.005
			Not ED	378	4.13	.88		
		Follow-Up (1st Grade)	ED	189	3.58	.96	21.30	<.005
			Not ED	295	3.96	.84		
	Second	Initial	ED	233	3.16	1.15	52.37	<.005
			Not ED	467	3.75	.94		
		Final	ED	227	3.78	1.05	24.11	<.005
			Not ED	453	4.16	.87		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	186	3.07	1.03	2.32	n.s.
			Not ED	413	3.20	.95		
	Third	Initial	ED	233	2.78	.96	94.37	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.46	.82		
		Final	ED	233	3.26	1.03	33.28	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.71	.94		

(continued)

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item	Year		Sample	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
2. Relationships with Teachers	First	Initial	ED	242	3.24	1.09	76.00	<.005
			Not ED	549	3.87	.87		
		Final	ED	242	3.71	1.00	33.50	<.005
			Not ED	515	4.14	.92		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	239	3.80	1.02	29.90	<.005
			Not ED	378	4.22	.88		
		Follow-Up (1st Grade)	ED	189	3.65	1.11	14.14	<.005
			Not ED	295	4.00	.92		
	Second	Initial	ED	233	3.27	1.22	45.76	<.005
			Not ED	467	3.82	.90		
		Final	ED	227	3.87	1.02	15.48	<.005
			Not ED	453	4.17	.91		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	186	3.80	1.01	<1	n.s.
			Not ED	413	3.87	.96		
	Third	Initial	ED	233	2.89	.94	91.73	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.57	.84		
		Final	ED	233	3.28	.99	44.44	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.78	.90		

(continued)

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item	Year		Sample	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
3. Creative Use of Individual Activities	First	Initial	ED	242	3.38	1.00	47.71	< .005
			Not ED	549	3.86	.84		
		Final	ED	242	4.09	.90	13.79	< .005
			Not ED	515	4.33	.79		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	239	3.90	.92	< 1	n.s.
			Not ED	378	3.97	.91		
		Follow-Up (1st Grade)	ED	189	3.71	.94	7.69	< .01
			Not ED	295	3.94	.88		
	Second	Initial	ED	233	3.45	1.06	46.03	< .005
			Not ED	467	3.96	.87		
		Final	ED	227	3.87	1.01	24.35	< .005
			Not ED	453	4.25	.88		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	186	3.96	1.00	< 1	n.s.
			Not ED	413	3.96	.91		
	Third	Initial	ED	233	3.20	.90	49.21	< .005
			Not ED	452	3.67	.79		
		Final	ED	233	3.60	.84	15.52	< .005
			Not ED	452	3.86	.81		

(continued)

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item	Year		Sample	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity	First	Initial	ED	242	3.41	1.11	61.33	<.005
			Not ED	549	4.00	.92		
		Final	ED	242	3.90	.93	18.64	<.005
			Not ED	515	4.20	.84		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	239	3.92	1.06	23.88	<.005
			Not ED	378	4.30	.87		
		Follow-Up (1st Grade)	ED	189	4.08	.99	8.15	<.005
			Not ED	295	4.33	.88		
	Second	Initial	ED	233	3.22	1.17	48.31	<.005
			Not ED	467	3.81	1.00		
		Final	ED	227	3.72	1.11	22.16	<.005
			Not ED	453	4.10	.94		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	186	3.66	1.11	2.63	n.s.
			Not ED	413	3.81	.97		
	Third	Initial	ED	233	3.01	1.10	64.40	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.66	.95		
		Final	ED	233	3.45	.98	20.44	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.78	.86		

(continued)

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item	Year		Sample	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation	F	p
5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity	First	Initial	ED	242	3.56	1.10	65.08	<.005
			Not ED	549	4.14	.84		
		Final	ED	242	3.80	1.02	24.48	<.005
			Not ED	515	4.16	.89		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	239	3.94	1.04	16.08	<.005
			Not ED	378	4.26	.93		
		Follow-Up (1st Grade)	ED	189	3.93	1.14	29.97	<.005
			Not ED	295	4.42	.84		
	Second	Initial	ED	233	3.27	1.24	54.08	<.005
			Not ED	467	3.91	1.00		
		Final	ED	222	3.66	1.06	25.79	<.005
			Not ED	453	4.06	.94		
		Follow-Up (Kdg.)	ED	186	1.95	1.05	1.65	n.s.
			Not ED	413	1.84	.99		
	Third	Initial	ED	233	3.13	1.10	65.16	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.80	.98		
		Final	ED	233	3.42	.92	42.61	<.005
			Not ED	452	3.89	.87		

* It should be noted that the higher score represents the more positive end of each five-point scale.

It may be seen that all PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems were rated less positively than their non-emotionally handicapped counterparts on all scales at the beginning and end of the PCEE Program year. The results from the follow-up ratings in kindergarten show that first project year emotionally handicapped pupils were less positively rated by their kindergarten teachers than were the non-emotionally handicapped pupils on four of the five scales whereas the two groups of pupils from the second project year were rated as being substantially the same with respect to all five items (i.e., there were no statistically significant differences). The first project year pupils who were rated by their first grade teachers showed differences on all five items favoring the non-emotionally handicapped pupils.

The results reported above show some similarities as well as some differences for the three project years. In all years, the vast majority of PCEE pupils identified as having emotional problems who were deficient in their initial ratings met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their end of the project year ratings. Also, in all years, PCEE pupils were found to have less positive ratings than pupils identified as not having emotional problems, both initially and at the end of each project year. The major dissimilarity between the first two project years may be seen in the follow-up results. Whereas the first project year ED pupils were rated less positively than the non-ED pupils by both their kindergarten and first grade teachers, the second project year ED pupils were judged by their kindergarten teachers to be non-significantly different from non-ED pupils on all five items of the rating scale. It may be that these differences between the results of the first two project years might be du e to increased supportive relationships between the PCEE teaching staff and the specialists involved in the emotionally handicapped component.

e. Process Objective One, The Child

> Psychological examiners will conduct intensive psychological diagnostic evaluations of pupils who, on the basis of the screening assessments, are referred for testing because of their apparent functioning within intellectual ability ranges of mental retardation.

During each project year, a certain proportion of pupils were referred for further testing because of apparent low intellectual functioning or mental retardation. These pupils were tested using the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test and the Vineland Social Maturity Test. Based on this further screening, pupils who were identified as being truly functioning at low intellectual levels were given special programs including home teaching for some by specialists or special programming by specialists carried out by the home-school teacher, and retested at the end of each program year. The results of these pupils on initial and final testing are summarized in Table 30. (Frequency distributions on these tests may be found in Appendix O.)

Table 30
A Summary of Further Screening and Final Testing of Pupils Identified to be Mentally Retarded

Test	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Range of Scores
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test (Mental Age)	First	8	Initial	41.625	4.68	2.94	<.05	32-46
			Final	53.75	3.87			48-60
	Second	14	Initial	52.86	6.82	5.03	<.01	40-64
			Final	60.86	6.62			52-74
	Third	12	Initial	42.83	9.81	6.99	<.01	25-55
			Final	52.42	10.96			31-67
Vineland Social Maturity Scale (Social Age)	First	8	Initial	51.00	8.48	2.76	<.05	42-62
			Final	60.29	8.38			46-70
	Second	15	Initial	51.87	13.37	5.42	<.01	24-76
			Final	66.07	11.08			34-78
	Third	13	Initial	52.92	15.66	3.33	<.01	26-87
			Final	60.69	17.30			25-84

It can be seen in the table that those pupils identified as being mentally retarded showed statistically significant gains in their average scores on both instruments. The average gain in mental age, as measured by the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, was nearly 10 months for all three project years (the range was eight months gain to more than 12 months gain) during the six months between test administrations. The average gain in social age, as measured by the Vineland

Social Maturity Scale was nearly 10.5 months for all three project years (the range was from 7-3/4 months to more than 14 months gain) during the six months between testings.

f. Product Objective One, The Parent

> Each parent of a child identified as emotionally disturbed receiving home visits, who was rated by the teacher as being deficient in interaction with the child on the items listed below during the first Home Teaching Session, will increase by a minimum of one step on each five-point rating scale as assessed by the teacher during the last home visit of the Program.
>
> 1. Awareness of child's needs
> 2. Quality of motivation
> 3. Quality of reinforcement

The parents of those pupils identified as having emotional problems (and who remained in the program the entire project year) were rated by their children's teachers on the five-point scales listed in the objective both at the beginning and end of each program year. The three items on which they were rated, together with the N's and percentages on each scale point for this group, as well as the total sample, a subsample including all parents of children identified as having handicaps, and a subsample of parents of children without handicaps, are given in Appendix B. A summary of the initial and final ratings on the three scales for parents of pupils having emotional problems is given in Table 31.

Table 31

A Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Parents' Interaction with Those Pupils Who Have Been Identified as Having Emotional Problems

Rating Scale	Project Year	N		Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p	Deficient* N	Deficient* %
Aware vs. Unaware of Childs' Needs	First	225	Initial	3.28	1.03	10.07	<.01	50	22
			Final	4.06	.90			7	3
	Second	210	Initial	3.88	1.15	5.31	<.01	31	15
			Final	4.30	.90			10	5
	Third	218	Initial	3.83	1.16	4.71	<.01	31	14
			Final	4.18	.90			9	4
Positive vs. Negative Motivation	First	225	Initial	3.48	1.00	10.11	<.01	30	13
			Final	4.20	.81			5	2
	Second	210	Initial	4.07	1.02	4.81	<.01	14	7
			Final	4.40	.84			8	4
	Third	218	Initial	4.01	1.03	4.78	<.01	19	9
			Final	4.36	.88			6	3
Positive vs. Negative Reinforcement	First	225	Initial	3.44	1.00	10.75	<.01	30	13
			Final	4.21	.80			4	2
	Second	210	Initial	4.09	1.03	4.51	<.01	15	7
			Final	4.40	.85			9	4
	Third	218	Initial	4.03	1.01	4.52	<.01	18	8
			Final	4.36	.88			6	3

*Deficiency was defined as a rating of "2" or less on each five-point scale.

As can be seen in the table, these parents were rated as being more aware of their children's needs as well as using more positive motivation and reinforcement techniques at the end of each project year than they were at the beginning of each year. These findings may be inferred from both the statistically significant differences between initial and final means and the decreasing proportions of parents found to be deficient in these traits at the end of each program year as contrasted with the beginning of the year ratings.

Analyses of individual changes made by those parents of children identified as having emotional problems who were judged to be initially deficient (rated as "2" or less on each five-point scale) are given below for each of the three project years.

1) Aware versus unaware of child's needs

a) First Project Year - Of the 50 parents rated as initially deficient on this scale, 17 (34%) gained one step, 21 (42%) gained two steps, and 11 (22%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 49 (98%) of the parents who were judged to be deficient in their awareness of their children's needs at the beginning of the program year gained one or more steps in their end of the year ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 31 parents rated as initially deficient on this scale, seven (23%) gained one step, 10 (32%) gained two steps, and nine (29%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. Altogether, 26 (84%) of the parents who were judged to be deficient in their awareness of their children's needs at the beginning of the second program year gained one or more steps in their end of the year ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Thirty-one (14%) of the 218 parents rated twice were judged to be initially deficient in their awareness of their children's needs. Of these 31 parents, nine (29%) gained one step, nine (29%) gained two steps, and eight (26%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 26 (84%) of the 31 parents found to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion of a one step gain.

2) Positive versus negative motivation

a) First Project Year - Of the 30 parents rated as being deficient in their use of positive motivation techniques at the beginning of the program year, 9 (30%) gained one step, 14 (47%) gained two steps, and 6 (20%) gained three or more steps in their year end ratings. In sum, 29 (97%) of the 30 parents initially judged to be deficient in this trait improved by at least one step in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 14 parents rated as being deficient in their use of positive motivation techniques at the beginning of the program year, three (21%) gained one step, three (21%) gained two steps, and four (29%) gained three or more steps in their final ratings. In sum, 10 (71%) of the 14 parents initially judged to be deficient in this trait improved by at least one step in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Nineteen (9%) of the 218 parents rated twice were judged to be initially deficient in the use of positive techniques of motivation. Of these 19 parents, three (16%) gained one step, six (32%) gained two steps, and seven (37%) gained three steps on their final ratings. In total, 16 (84%) of the 19 parents found to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion set for them.

3) Positive versus negative reinforcement

a) First Project Year - Of the 30 parents judged to be deficient in this trait at the beginning of the program year, 7 (23%) gained one step, 13 (43%) gained two steps, and 9 (30%) gained three or more steps in their end of the year ratings. Altogether, 29 (97%) of the parents rated as initially deficient in their use of positive reinforcement techniques with their children gained at least one step in their final ratings.

b) Second Project Year - Of the 15 parents judged to be initially deficient in this trait, three (20%) gained one step, four (27%) gained two steps, and four (27%) gained three or more steps in their end of the year ratings. Altogether, 11 (73%) of the parents rated as being initially deficient in their use of positive reinforcement techniques with their children gained at least one step in their final ratings.

c) Third Project Year - Eighteen (8%) of the 218 parents rated twice were judged to be initially deficient in their use of positive reinforcement techniques. Of these 18 parents, four (22%) gained one step, six (33%) gained two steps, and six (33%) gained three steps. In total, 16 (89%) of the 18 parents judged to be initially deficient on this scale met or exceeded the criterion.

In general, between 71% and 98% of the parents who were found to be initially deficient in their modes of interacting with their children met or exceeded the criterion of a one-step gain in their final ratings. The criterion was attained most completely during the first project year where the greatest proportions of parents were judged to be initially deficient. At the end of all three project years, less than 6% of the parents were found to be deficient on any of the scales. In other words, more than 94% of the parents of emotionally handicapped pupils were judged to be interacting appropriately with their children by the end of each project year.

Additional Analyses

Comparisons were made between teacher ratings of parents of emotionally handicapped pupils and parents of non-emotionally handicapped pupils on the three five-point scales at the beginning and end of each project year. A summary of the results of these comparisons may be found in Table 32.

Table 32

A Summary of Comparisons of Parents' Initial and Final Attitudes Toward Their Children Between Parents of Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems and Parents of Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems

Rating Scale	Project Year		Group*	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	P
Aware vs. Unaware of Child's Needs	First	Initial	EH	232	3.29	1.04	15.03	<.005
			NEH	523	3.60	1.03		
		Final	EH	226	4.06	.99	9.92	<.005
			NEH	499	4.29	.88		
	Second	Initial	EH	230	3.89	1.15	27.07	<.005
			NEH	458	4.31	.91		
		Final	EH	224	4.29	.91	10.11	<.005
			NEH	447	4.51	.79		
	Third	Initial	EH	218	3.83	1.16	33.23	<.005
			NEH	432	4.32	.95		
		Final	EH	218	4.18	.90	18.90	<.005
			NEH	432	4.48	.79		
Positive vs. Negative Motivation	First	Initial	EH	232	3.48	1.01	6.49	<.025
			NEH	523	3.68	.95		
		Final	EH	226	4.20	.81	4.61	<.05
			NEH	488	4.35	.85		
	Second	Initial	EH	230	4.08	1.01	20.86	<.005
			NEH	458	4.41	.83		
		Final	EH	224	4.38	.86	6.95	<.01
			NEH	447	4.55	.76		
	Third	Initial	EH	218	4.01	1.03	28.35	<.005
			NEH	432	4.42	.88		
		Final	EH	218	4.36	.88	10.77	<.005
			NEH	432	4.57	.71		

(continued)

Table 32 (continued)

Rating Scale	Project Year		Group*	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Positive vs. Negative Reinforcement	First	Initial	EH	232	3.46	1.00	4.54	<.05
			NEH	523	3.63	.97		
		Final	EH	226	4.22	.80	3.07	n.s.
			NEH	488	4.33	.85		
	Second	Initial	EH	230	4.11	1.02	18.09	<.005
			NEH	458	4.42	.84		
		Final	EH	224	4.37	.87	7.15	<.01
			NEH	447	4.55	.76		
	Third	Initial	EH	218	4.03	1.01	57.02	<.005
			NEH	432	4.40	.89		
		Final	EH	218	4.36	.88	11.82	<.005
			NEH	432	4.58	.70		

*EH = Parents of pupils with emotional problems.
*NEH = Parents of pupils not identified as having emotional problems.

It can be seen in this table that there were statistically significant differences between the two groups of parents on all initial and final mean ratings favoring the parents of non-handicapped pupils. A careful inspection of the differences between pairs of means shows that there was a narrowing of the gap between the final means of the two groups compared to their initial differences. Further, while both groups of parents improved their ratings the group of parents with emotionally handicapped pupils made greater gains than the other group of parents.

In summary, the vast majority (more than 94%) of parents of pupils identified to have emotional problems were judged by their children's teachers to be aware of their children's needs and to be using appropriate motivation and reinforcement techniques by the end of each program year.

g. Process Objective One, The Parent

> Parents of pupils identified as learning disabled will have the opportunity to confer about their problems with the Consultant Specialist for the Learning Disabled.

Parents of children who were seen by the Learning Disabilities Specialists were essentially seen for parent conferences by the teacher specialists. All parents of learning disabled children were involved in a weekly five to ten minute conference by the teacher specialist following the weekly home teaching sessions. If parents related special concerns, the specialists in turn conferred with the Consultant Specialists and appropriate strategies were developed.

The Consultant Specialist in Educational Problems was involved in the staffing of all children seen by the Learning Disabilities Specialists. However, in fact, parents of pupils identified as seriously learning disabled conferred with the Child Development Consultants who were in touch with the Consultant Specialist and the Learning Disabilities Specialist. In using the Child Development Consultants to confer with parents, we were broadening the concept of service to parents for a learning disabled child has both educational and behavioral problems and an understanding of the total child by the parents is necessary. The use of people with counseling skills is, therefore, justified in working with parents. When further specialized evaluation was recommended or placement for the following school year considered, the Child Development Consultant working with the specialists in learning problems, handled the procedure and unified the service to parents.

The Director of the program was also contacted by parents in regard to further evaluation and test interpretation of a child. In some cases, the Child Development Consultant and the Director together conferred with parents. In other cases when only test interpretation was desired, the project director met with parents.

h. Process Objective Two, The Parent

> Parents of pupils identified as functioning within intellectual ability ranges of mental retardation will have the opportunity to confer about their problems with the Consultant Psychologist for the Mentally Retarded and Specialist in Special Education.

All such conferences were held with either the Psychological Examiner or the Special Education Consultant. During the year, the Psychological Examiner conducted 46 parent conferences and the Special Education Consultant met with thirteen parents.

i. Process Objective Three, The Parent

> Parents of children identified as emotionally disturbed will have the opportunity to confer about their problems with the Consultant Psychologist for the Emotionally Disturbed and the Child Development Consultants in group or individual counseling sessions.

The total number of parents in contact with our specialist represented 87 children. The number of contacts with each parent varied depending upon the case. While emphasis had been placed on facilitating teacher effectiveness with parents, it was recognized that certain parents had to be seen by the Child Development Consultants on an individual basis.

Members of this component also worked with parents in group counseling session. They conducted a session for parents entitled, Growing Up OK - The Early Years, in each of the Saturday School Centers early in the school year. Approximately 175 people attended these meetings. During the school year, two sessions for parents were held on Saturday in each Saturday School Center. These programs were open-ended in nature and centered on concerns expressed by parents. The title for these meetings was How Does Your Family Grow? Approximately 150 parents were involved in these meetings. It was found that parent groups held at different times of the school year were most appropriate. Problems for parents became more acute at a particular time and we found that in our meetings we generally were serving different groups of people.

j. Process Objective One, The Staff

> Teacher Specialists in learning disabilities will develop and use appropriate habilitative programs with pupils identified as being learning disabled. The appropriateness of each program will be judged on a dichotomous basis by the Consultant Specialist in learning disabilities. Programs judged inappropriate will be adjusted immediately after the assessment.

Written test summaries on all children given indepth learning disabilities evaluation by the two teacher specialists for this sub-component were submitted to the Director and the Consultant Specialist in Learning Disabilities for review. Cases were discussed at length in a staffing with the Consultant, Special Education Specialist, and Psychological Examiner. Appropriate habilitative programs were then planned and approved by the Consultant Specialist in terms of individual strengths and weaknesses. In the judgment of the Consultant Specialist no problems were found to be so pure that single commercially marketed habilitative programs could be used in their entirely. Rather, individual programs were designed from a number of sources and altered as progress by the child indicated. Weekly logs outlining home teaching methods and progress of each child seen by these teacher specialists were submitted to the Director and Consultant Specialist for review and recommendations on changes as needed.

Suggestions included:

1) Therapeutic planning alterations
2) Counseling suggestions
3) Methods for coordination of Saturday School programming and home visit programming

Test summaries and weekly logs were submitted to the Project Director for inclusion in the permanent records. Copies were also made for the child's Saturday School teacher as an aid in programming for the child in Saturday School and in her Home Teaching visits.

Teacher Specialists also conferred regularly with teachers during the team meetings so that an integrated program was provided children determined to have educational problems.

See Report Sub-Component for Educational Problems, Allan Yater, Ph.D. Appendix Q.

k. Process Objective Two, The Staff

> The staff, together with the Consultant Specialist in learning disabilities will develop an optimal predictive index for early identification of children with learning disabilities. The battery of tests used in the initial screening of all PCEE Program pupils plus the battery of tests used in further diagnosing pupils with learning disabilities will be subjected to a factor analysis to determine the most parsimonious and predictive set of instruments for identification of learning disabled children.

Selection of children for indepth learning disabilities evaluation was carried out by an analysis of the screening test results by the Consultant Specialist for Learning Disabilities, the Special Education Specialist and the two Learning Disabilities Specialists.

The criteria used to identify the child with possible learning disabilities based on the screening test results is as follows:

I. Severity: Vulnerable

  a. Child is one standard deviation below the norms on at least one test.

  b. Anecdotal comments by either parent or teacher.

II. Severity: Suspect

  a. Child is two standard deviations below the norms on one testing.

  b. Child is one standard deviation below the norm on two or three tests.

  c. Anecdotal comments by either parent or teacher.

III. Severity: High Risk

a. Child is two standard deviations below on two or three tests.

b. Child is non-testable.

c. Anecdotal comments be either teacher or parent.

All of the above children were referred to the learning specialists. Children listed as high risk were given further diagnostic testing immediately. If a child was determined as suspect and scored two standard deviations below on the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration without any other irregularity noted, the special education specialist observed the child's performance and/or gave the Purdue Visual Motor Test. All other suspect cases were given the complete diagnostic battery, consisting of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability; the Goodenough-Harris Draw A Man Test; the Teich-vonWolfseck Motor Test and the Beery Test of Visual Motor Integration. Children listed in the vulnerable category are observed in the classroom and further diagnostic testing will be conducted if necessary.

It was originally planned to perform a factor analysis using scores on both screening and diagnostic instruments to determine the most predictive set of instruments for identification of learning disabled pupils.

However, because the number of pupils identified as learning disabled was found to be relatively small this could not be done. (See Appendix Q, Final Report, Sub-Component for Educational Problems, Allan Yater, Ph.D.)

1. Process Objective Three, The Staff

> Each PCEE teacher will keep records of children's displays of emotional disturbance which occur during Saturday School for a subsample of children identified as emotionally handicapped. Summaries will be made by the Consultant Psychologist for the Emotionally Handicapped.

Records on children with severe emotional problems were reported to the Consultant Psychologist for the Emotionally Handicapped and the two Child Development Consultants during the semi-weekly planning meetings. They, in turn maintained written records on these children and used this information in parent contact. Each teacher also kept a written record on one child who posed unusual problems. The psychologist in charge of the Child Development Component reviewed these records and comments on them in his final report. (See Final Report - Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D. Appendix P.

m. Process Objective Four, The Staff

> Each teacher whose class contains children who show evidence of emotional disturbance will consult with the emotional disturbance consultant at least once a month.

The Consultant Specialist for the Emotionally Handicapped or one of the two Child Development Consultants provided under this sub-component for the handicapped were available to consult with teachers twice monthly throughout the school year. Each consultant met with the teaching team of three teachers for an hour each session and attendance records indicated that each teacher met with one of the three specialists for the emotionally handicapped twice a month. We believed that the process developed in a continuous dialogue between teacher and consultant was of great benefit to the teacher and ultimately to the parents and children involved. It should also be noted that the consultants were available every Saturday to observe Children and meet with teachers and parents at the various Saturday School Centers. The Final Report verifies that emphasis was placed by this component on working with the staff of all six teaching centers. (See Appendix P, The Final Report - Sub-Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D.)

5. MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Inspection of project documentation will verify the completion of those management process objectives scheduled for completion as of the date of this report. Objectives and their proposed completion dates are as follows (asterisks indicate completed objectives):

	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	Date to be Completed
1)	Develop management checklist to monitor accomplishment of the following objectives by	9/73*
2)	Keep a weekly log on the progress of the program by	6/74*
3)	Assign staff to various school centers by	8/73*
4)	Select and purchase materials as needed by	6/74*
5)	Develop, revise, produce Home Teaching Report, Nursery School Scale, Rating Scale of Self Esteem, Parent Participation form for PCEE Program, Kindergarten, and Beginning Primary use by	9/73*
6)	Organize and implement procedures for parent contact and child enrollment by	9/73*
7)	Arrange and implement procedures for initial screening by	9/73*
8)	Arrange for further individual diagnosis as needed by	11/73*
9)	Organize and implement instructional program for children with learning problems by	11/73*
10)	Coordinate handicapped program with outside referral agencies by	6/74*
11)	Keep a written observation of teacher performance in two Saturday School sessions and one Home Teaching Visit by the director. Principals will also evaluate teacher performance on home visits	6/74*

12) Conduct evaluation sessions with all teachers based on evaluation of director, principals, and performance targets of the teachers 3/74*

13) Observe kindergarten teachers and Beginning Primary teachers and make recommendations as to curriculum and teaching style 6/74*

14) Complete curriculum guide including rationale, outline, sequence of skills and learning activities by 2/74*

15) Plan and implement staff inservice programs by 7/74*

16) Implement Home Teaching and Saturday School Program by 6/74*

17) Prepare weekly Home Activity Guide by 6/74*

18) Prepare Learning Packets dealing with various learning processes for children with special problems 6/74*

19) Prepare communication and dissemination packet by 6/74*
(This will include description of program, curriculum guide, home activity guide, as well as monographs describing the processes involved in staff development, curriculum, parent involvement and evaluation)

20) Arrange for Parent Study Groups and Parent Counseling Sessions by 6/74*

21) Arrange for monthly reports and staffings on handicapped children by 6/74*

22) Arrange for reporting of feedback information by and to project staff, other school staff, and Community Council by 6/74*

23) Plan for continuation of the program after Federal funding ends 5/74*

24) Prepare a summary of the findings obtained in the second project year by 11/73*

25) Coordinate the independent audit procedures with the evaluation so that the auditor can see all data and findings after they are processed and written up by 8/74*

26) Collect data from Kindergarten and Beginning Primary Teachers in regard to standardized testing, attitude scales, home teaching, and parent participation records. Collect baseline data on Continuing Primary students using a standardized achievement instrument 5/74*

27) Coordinate the evaluation activities of all project components by 6/74*

28) Communicate to the project staff all the findings on the process objectives at intermediate points during the project operation by 6/74*

29) Arrange for storage and retrieval of all information collected on children and parents for the duration of the project. Files will be updated one month after the collection of any additional data 6/74*

30) Prepare and submit reports to the USOE 8/74*

The Project Director was concerned with items not listed in the management process which developed during the school year. Two projects require special mention. The validation report on the project was prepared for review by the validation team who made an on-site visit to the project and at that time approved the project for validation. Also, a proposal as a Developer-Demonstrator project was prepared for the Office of Education. This project was approved for funding and development in the 1974-75 school year. As a national demonstration site, the project will have the opportunity to develop additional materials, disseminate information, provide mini-workshops and training for school districts wishing to adopt the program.

C. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At the conclusion of a three year project developed for four year old children and their parents in the Ferguson-Florissant School District, we feel justifiably proud of the results. We believe that the major components of the program, THE CHILD, THE HANDICAPPED, THE PARENTS, and THE STAFF have melded together into a program that is worthy of dissemination and replication. In setting goals with forty-four objectives for the various components with follow-up data, we have developed a program for young children which has provided a unique service to the child and his parents, and has helped to change the role of the school. For in this program, we in the school have expressed to parents that we are merely supportive of their work and in order for the child to succeed the home and school must form a partnership.

Evaluation of cognitive and affective gains in children after eight months in the program showed significant growth by a large majority of the children who exceeded the expected gain. It should also be pointed out that children with the lowest entering status made the greatest rate of gain in most instances.

Furthermore, the program focused on the screening and identification of those children with learning handicaps or potential learning problems. In providing service to these children, either through special teaching, counseling with parents, special programming or referrals, many problems have been ameliorated and only four children were referred to programs for the handicapped at age 5. These include two children who will enter classes for the orthopedically handicapped and two who will enter programs for severe learning disabilities. One child with visual impairment and one with a severe hearing loss will attend kindergarten but will receive assistance from the itinerant teachers in the Special School District.

The follow-up data from kindergarten and beginning primary indicates that all children are achieving at a higher level than children without preschool experience. Children who were identified as having handicapping conditions while not achieving as high as the rest of the PCEE children were substantially better than children without preschool experience. In effect, we can say that many problems detected at four can be remediated and gains maintained in the early school years. The integration of the handicapped into the regular program also tended to have a positive effect on the intellectual, personal and social development of the handicapped as well as the rest of the children.

Involvement of the parents in the program was of utmost value. The opportunity for the mother and the teacher to work together allowed for learning on the part of each and a joint effort toward helping the child. The verbal and written comments of parents in evaluating the program attest to the positive rapport established between home and school.

The dedication of the staff was of great importance to the program's success. Teachers received much personal satisfaction in working with mother and child. The weekly two-hour team meetings provided the means for staff development, teacher planning, and assistance provided by consultants. The Parent-Child Early Education Program has become more and more a part of the school district. Principals have accompanied the Saturday School teacher on a home visit, Saturday School and kindergarten teachers have visited in classrooms and shared progress reports on children, children's permanent record cards have been initiated in the PCEE Program. Ongoing service to children with learning and behavioral problems has been provided at the kindergarten level.

The program has also developed materials which have been a value to the program as well as for dissemination purposes. Weekly home activity guides which suggest learning activities for parent and child are provided. In addition, we have prepared materials for parent-teacher use on motor skills and language development. A curriculum guide has been developed largely by the teaching staff. Monographs describing certain aspects of the program have been developed on the following topics: Staff Development, Home Teaching Plans, Working with Parents, and

Diagnosis.

Various other promotional materials describing the program and a summary of evaluation results are available. A packet of materials including Parent Newsletters, various evaluation instruments used in the program and the above materials are all available for use.

Further, we should point to the relatively low cost of the project. For approximately $177.00 a year per child, we have provided a program which offers an alternative model to early education that could easily be adapted by other school systems to meet comparable needs.

The program has met its goals. The process involved in reaching the objectives has resulted in the development of a firmly established model for preschool education.

Recognition of program success has come through several sources. The program has been validated because of its record of success in areas relating to innovativeness, pupil achievement, cost-effectiveness and program administration. The Educational Pacesetter Award has been given the project by the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services because of this achievement.

In addition, the project has received funding as a

Developer-Demonstration Project, Title III ESEA. As a national demonstration site, the program will develop additional student and teacher materials, provide service to potential adapters and continue to disseminate evaluation results. Mini-workshops are planned to provide information and instruction in program components to people interested in early education programs.

Finally, program success has been recognized by the school district. The district is continuing the total program. The statements on the following pages indicate the support of both the Board of Education and the Superintendent to the program. With the assistance of funding from the handicapped under Missouri law, services to the handicapped child will be expanded. - Thus, in the next school year, support from local, state and federal sources will allow us to continue our current program, expand our services, and serve as a model for potential adapters. We are very proud of the past results and look forward to even greater service to young children, their parents, and the educational community.

Name of Project: PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

School District: Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2

Address: 655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

We, the members of the Board of Education of the Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2, certify that the above cited project will, if validated, serve as a demonstration site for a period of at least one calendar year.

Lloyd L. Sweeney
President, Board of Education

March 13, 1974
Date

Name of Project: PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

School District: Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2

Address:
655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

I hereby certify that the above cited project, which is under my administration, will be continued with local and state funds after the termination of Federal funding.

Warren M. Brown
Superintendent of Schools

13 March 1974
Date

SECTION C - PUPIL POPULATION DATA (Continued)

3. Additional Project Data (Continued)

h. Estimated percentage of target group which is:

Rural (fewer than 2,500 inhabitants) Percent____

Urban (more than 50,000 inhabitants) Percent 100%

Other Demographic Areas (2,500 to 50,000) Percent____

i. Estimated percentage of student participants who reside in Model Cities Area Percent NA

j. Estimated percentage of title III, section 306 funds proposed for support of services to nonpublic school participants Percent NA

SECTION D - TOTAL PROGRAM STAFF (See instructions)

POSITION CATEGORY	Positions Assigned to Project			
	Number Full-Time	Part-time		Total Full-Time Equiv. (Columns 2 + 4)
		Number	Full-Time Equiv.	
a. ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION	1			1
b. TEACHER				
(1) Pre-Kindergarten		16	10	10
(2) Kindergarten				
(3) Grades 1-6				
(4) Grades 7-12				
(5) Other				
c. SPECIALISTS		8	2-1/8	2-1/8
d. PUPIL PERSONNEL WORKERS				
e. EVALUATORS		1	1/4	1/4
f. TEACHER ASSISTANTS, TEACHER AIDES		4	2	2
g. CLERICAL PERSONNEL	1	1	3/4	1-3/4
h. COMMUNITY LIAISON PERSONNEL				
i. ALL OTHER PERSONNEL		12	1-1/2	1-1/2

SECTION E - HANDICAPPED PROJECT PARTICIPATION ONLY

1. Number of Children Served, by Handicapping Condition and Grade Level; and Number of Personnel Receiving Inservice Training with Title III, Sec. 306 Funds.

Type of Handicap	GRADE LEVEL					INSERVICE TRAINING			
	Pre-K	K	1-6	7-12	Total	Teacher	Teacher Aides	Other	Total
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a. Trainable Mentally Retarded	1								
b. Educable Mentally Retarded	24								
c. Specific Learning Disabilities	60								
d. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed	95								
e. Other Health Impaired	1								
f. Crippled	2								
g. Visually Impaired	7								
h. Deaf-Blind	-								
i. Deaf	-								
j. Hard of Hearing	31								
k. Speech Impaired	18								
l. Total	239				239	74		3	77

Inservice training on working with the handicapped was presented the teaching staff of 18 teachers and 2 learning problems specialists by consultants to the program in bi-weekly meetings. In addition, 54 elementary teachers were involved in either a workshop dealing with behavioral problems or learning problems led by program consultants. Three college students in Special Education received a practicum in the program.

2. Number of Handicapped Children Served Who Attend Nonpublic Schools: NA

3. Distribution By Ethnic Groups

POPULATION	NEGRO	INDIAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED (See instruct.)	CAUCASIAN (Other than Span. Surnamed	OTHER	TOTAL
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Student Participants	3	0	0	1	236		239

SECTION E - HANDICAPPED PROJECT PARTICIPATION ONLY (Continued)

4. Children Receiving Services - DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREA

CATEGORY	NUMBER
a. Urban Areas (over 50,000)	
b. Rural Areas (under 2,500)	
c. Other Demographic Areas (from 2,500 - 50,000)	
d. Total (Sum of Lines a., b., and c.)	
e. Student participants who reside in Model Cities Area	

SECTION F - TOTAL PROGRAM STAFF FOR HANDICAPPED (Component or Total Project)

	POSITION CATEGORY	Positions Assigned to Project			
		Number Full-Time	Part-time Number	Part-time Full-Time Equiv.	Total Full-Time Equiv. (Columns 2 + 4)
	1	2	3	4	5
a.	ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION		1	1/3	1/3
b.	TEACHERS				
	(1) Trainable Mentally Retarded				
	(2) Educable Mentally Retarded		1	1/8	1/8
	(3) Learning Disabled		2	2/3	2/3
	(4) Emotionally Disturbed		2	2/3	2/3
	(5) Other Health Impaired				
	(6) Crippled				
	(7) Visually Impaired				
	(8) Deaf-Blind				
	(9) Deaf				
	(10) Hard of Hearing		1	1/8	1/8
	(11) Speech Impaired		1	1/8	1/8
c.	SPECIALISTS		8	2-1/2	2-1/2
d.	PUPIL PERSONNEL WORKERS				
e.	EVALUATORS		1	1/8	1/8
f.	TEACHER ASSISTANTS, TEACHER AIDES		18	1/3	1/3
g.	CLERICAL PERSONNEL	1	1	1/2	1-1/2
h.	COMMUNITY LIAISON PERSONNEL				
i.	ALL OTHER PERSONNEL				

SPECIALISTS - 8 part-time persons counted as follows:

1	Consultant Specialist in Educational problems	1/4 time
1	Consultant Specialist in Child Development	1/2 time
2	Child Development Consultants	1/4 time ea.
1	Audiologist	1/8 time
1	Speech Consultant	1/8 time
1 <	Special Education Consultant	1/4 time
	Psychological Examiner	1/8 time
1	Special Education Consultant	1/4 time

87.6

INDEPENDENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AUDIT

INTERIM AUDIT REPORT

OF

USOE Project #OEG-0-71-1748(290)

FERGUSON-FLORISSANT PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2
655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

April, 1974

Prepared by:

EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.

Auditor Assigned:

Gary A. Mohrenweiser, Ph.D.

SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

The Interim Audit Report is one of three such reports being prepared for the Ferguson-Florissant Schools in connection with its Parent-Child Early Education Program, U.S.O.E. Project #OEG-0-71-1748(290). EMS certifies that it is acting as an independent auditor and has had no role in the development of the proposal or program or any other relationship with the Ferguson-Florissant Schools. This independent educational program audit is an external review of the project, designed to verify the results of the evaluation and to assess and report on the appropriateness of evaluation procedures being utilized. This audit is designed to follow the guidelines and intent of ESEA Title III, Section 306. In preparation of this report the auditors examined data through the following inputs:

1. Review of documentation supplied to the auditors prior to and during the site visits, including:
    a. Home Activity Guides
    b. How to Use Home Activity Guides
    c. Guides for Saturday School Parent Volunteers
    d. Copy of two booklets forming part of the series designed to help parents help their children in particular behavior areas of 1) listening; 2) motor skills.
    e. Packet of early education materials
    f. Putting Together a Staff Development Program for Pre-School Teachers.

   g. Curriculum Guide
   h. Interim Evaluation Report for 1973-74 Project Year dated March 8, 1974.

2. Information obtained during the site visits by Dr. Walter L. Hodges and Dr. Gary Mohrenweiser conducted March 23, 1974 and February 15-16, 1974, respectively, at the project offices located at 2295 Dunn Road, Florissant, Missouri 63033, and at various program delivery sites.

During the site visits, the auditors interviewed and discussed project activities with:

a. Ms. Marison Wilson, Project Director
b. Dr. Alice Kline, Project Evaluator
c. Representatives of the child development and special education components including:
   1. Dr. Sydney Kasper
   2. Mr. Tom Maloney
   3. Various other consultants and teachers involved with the project.

SECTION II
GENERAL AUDIT FINDINGS

This year's interim audit activities centered around three main areas: (1) Review of the Interim Evaluation Report for 1973-74; (2) Review of the curriculum guide being developed with the project; and (3) Observation of the Saturday School programs. Since the project is in its third and final year of operation under Title III funding, there was no submission of a continuation proposal. However, the project is actively involved as a site nominated for validation by the U. S. Office of Education and will be participating in validation activities.

As in the past, the interim evaluation report provided by the project is complete, well-organized and well-written. It provides information regarding the progress of the project on its various objectives during the past year as well as comparative data regarding similar activities during the past two years. This information is extremely valuable in gaining a perspective of the project's accomplishments. The auditors were also impressed with the activities in Saturday School. Each of the auditors had an opportunity to visit a variety of delivery sites and talk with consultants and teachers. The organization of the Saturday School, the commitment on the part of parents, teachers and consultants and the overall delivery of the program are worthy of the exemplary nature of the Saturday School project. The project has also completed a document entitled "Putting Together a Staff Development Program for Pre-School Teachers". This publication is the first in a series describing the activities and implementation of the Parent-Child Early Education Program. The information in these documents should be of particular interest to other educators who are interested in implementing a similar program.

SECTION III
SPECIFIC AUDIT FINDINGS

This section of the report follows the selected audit activities as outlined in the audit plan submitted to the Ferguson-Florissant Schools. Each objective audited is stated together with the proposed audit activities and subsequent audit findings. Numbers and descriptions associated with each objective correspond to those found in the original and/or revised proposal. Certain objectives have been grouped due to commonality of audit activities.

Child Component

Product Objective 1: Upon completion of the first year in the PCEE Program, each pupil will exceed his expected growth ...

Product Objective 2: Each primary target group pupil who was found to be deficient in teacher ratings will show an increase ...

Product Objective 3: Each primary target group pupil who was found to be rated as having less than very positive attitudes toward school will increase ...

Audit Activities: Sample and review report data.

Audit Findings: As agreed between the project and the auditor, on the basis of the auditor's suggestion, the analysis for these three objectives was postponed until the writing of the final evaluation report. This permitted resources to be devoted to completion of other evaluation activities and is reflected in the statements on page 9-11 of the interim evaluation report.

Product Objective 4: Each pupil who was rated ... less than average on self-esteem ... will increase ..

Audit Activities: Review test data.

Audit Findings: Test data reviewed and supported the conclusions found in the evaluation report and in Appendix A-1 & A-2.

Product Objective 5: Each child ... who is found to be deficient on parent ratings in the developmental areas will show an increase.

Audit Activities: Review evaluation report.

Audit Findings: The evaluation design called for paired t-test analysis to be completed. This analysis is presented on pages 14-33 of the interim report. In review of the source documents and computer analysis, the auditor found these documents to fully support the results presented in the evaluation report.

Product Objective 6: Upon entrance into kindergarten, children who have participated in the PCEE program will obtain higher parent rating scores.

Project Objective 7: Upon entrance into kindergarten, children who participated in the PCEE program will attain higher academic readiness scores..

Product Objective 8: Pupils who have participated in the PCEE program will have higher Stanford Early School Achievement scores ...

Audit Activities: Review evaluation report supportive documentation.

Audit Findings: The auditor reviewed with the project director and evaluator supportive documentation and computer analyses in relationship to these three objectives. The various control groups in each of the objectives were also reviewed and any changes in the evaluation design particularly in relationship to objective 6. The analysis fully supports the statements made in the interim evaluation report on pages 34-51.

Process Objective 3: Each PCEE pupil identified as having learning problems will be given individualized material ...

Audit Activities: Verify implementation.

Audit Findings: In discussions with the project director, consultants, and teachers, it was determined that this objective is being fully implemented as specified in the evaluation report.

Parent Component

Product Objective 1: Each parent receiving home visits who was rated by teachers as being less than very positive will increase ...

Audit Activities: Review data.

Audit Findings: As indicated on page 59 of the interim evaluation report, the auditor and the evaluator agreed to postpone reporting of these data until all data have been collected and can be reported in connection with the final evaluation report.

Process Objective 1: One parent from each family participating in the PCEE program will volunteer to assist in Saturday School ..

Audit Activities: Review attendance data.

Audit Findings: The auditors reviewed attendance data including that maintained by the project director as well as sign-up sheets for participation at the delivery sites. These documents supported the statements made in the evaluation report. It was further noted by the auditors during their site visit regarding attendance at Saturday School sessions, a significant number of parents, including fathers, were present during the sessions.

Process Objective 3: Parent study groups will be established ...

Audit Activities: Review implementation.

Audit Findings: In discussions with consultants and teachers, it was verified that the activities identified on pages 67 and 68 of the interim evaluation report were completed in reference to this objective.

Staff Component

Product Objective 1: Each PCEE teacher will utilize appropriate motivational techniques ...

Product Objective 2: Each PCEE teacher will be able to correctly identify learning problems ...

Product Objective 3: For those PCEE pupils identified as having learning problems, teachers will carry out prescriptions ...

Product Objective 4: PCEE teachers will establish positive relationships with parents ...

Audit Activities: Review data and interview staff.

Audit Findings: The staff rating sheets were sampled for completeness and accuracy to support the report regarding these objectives. Also consultants involved in this aspect of the program were interviewed in terms of the teachers' strategies in working with students with various disadvantaged or handicapped conditions. Data gained from these techniques support the results identified in the interim evaluation report.

Product Objective 5: Weekly home activity packets that complement the instruction given in Saturday School will be developed by the project director ...

Audit Activities: Review activity packets.

Audit Findings: These packets have been revised and re-used during the current year. In the sample review of Issues 73, 4-1, through 73, 4-20, as with previous reviews, it was noted that these guides have much to commend them. They are succinct, well-written, easy to follow and, in general, are activities that both parents and children should enjoy and from which both should learn. Further, these packets should provide an important dimension to the dissemination of this project.

Project Objective 6: The Parent-Child Education Curriculum Guide will be developed by the project director ...

Audit Activities: Review the guide.

Audit Findings: The Guide is presently in draft form and all major sections are included. The Guide includes:

Goals
Characteristics of Three and Four Year Old Children
A Statement on Assessment and Observation
The Parent
Language Skills and Concept Development
Math and Science Development
Motor Skills Development
Personal and Social Adjustment
Creative Arts

The auditor and project director reviewed the Curriculum Guide carefully with respect to the content, organization, and usefulness of such guides in general and this one in particular.

The process used in creating the Guide is in agreement with the project objective. In each step of the process, from the statement of philosophy to the suggested activities, the work of the teaching staff is apparent.

The major difficulty with any Guide of this type is the necessity to strike a balance between comprehensiveness and utility. If the authors delineated all possible objectives in each domain even for four-year-olds alone the potential users of the document would be overwhelmed by both the specificity of the objectives and the sheer weight of the volume. If the authors chose to limit the number of objectives severely, the resulting generality of the statements produced would provide so little real help for the user as to warrant the deletion of the word "Guide" from the title. Mr. Wilson and the auditor, at the time of the review, struggled with the problem of how to guide without being restrictive or vague. The resulting document, the auditor believes, is a reasonable compromise. The number of objectives been limited and they are stated clearly. Those that were vague were questioned. Mr. Wilson's responses to questions were positive and are likely to result in modications to make the document more useful. The practice of including several potential activities, the majority of which have been tried with four-year-olds, to attain each objective is an excellent approach.

Process Objective 1: Each PCEE teacher will attend at least two in-service sessions per month ...

Process Objective 2: Each kindergarten teacher will attend at least four in-service sessions ...

Process Objective 3: Each PCEE teacher demonstrate appropriate teaching techniques ...

Process Objective 4: Each PCEE teacher and kindergarten teacher will teach each other's classes at least once during the first year of the program ...

Process Objective 5: PCEE teachers will work collaborately with the project director to develop home activity packets ...

Process Objective 6: PCEE teachers will work collaborately with the project director to develop a curriculum guide.

Audit Activities: Review attendance records of meetings and determine implementation and process.

Audit Findings: In review of a sample of the attendance records, and discussion with project staff, it was determined that these activities are being completed as specified. Some of the objectives referred to the first year of operation have been modified to some extent with the continuing years. The interim evaluation report adequately presents information regarding these objectives.

Handicap Component

Product Objective 1: Each child identified as learning disabled and scores below average on social growth and independence will increase his score.

Audit Activities: Review and inspect data.

Audit Findings: As previously agreed to between the project and the auditor, the analysis of data related to this objective is being postponed until the final evaluation report to permit allocation of resources to other areas.

Product Objective 3: Each PCEE child identified as emotionally disturbed will decrease in this rating on the basis of the program ..

Audit Activities: Review data.

Audit Findings: The design specified a t-test analysis of the data. This analysis is completed and presented on pages 97 and 98 of the interim evaluation report.

Parent Component - Handicapped

Process Objective 1: The parents of pupils identified as learning disabled will have an opportunity to confer with specialists.

Process Objective 2: The parents of pupils identified as functioning within an intellectual ability range of mental retardation will have an opportunity to confer with specialists.

Process Objective 3: The parents of children identified as emotionally disturbed will have an opportunity to confer with specialists.

Audit Activities: Review specialists' reports.

Audit Findings: In review of specialists' reports and discussions with staff, it was verified that services were being provided to parents of these types of children.

SECTION IV
RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the report which usually contains recommendations for the project's consideration has been incorporated into the Specific Audit Findings, Section III. In particular, in relationship to the development of the Curriculum Guide, a number of concerns are indicated which were discussed with the project director during the site visits. It is anticipated that these suggestions have already been considered by the project in its development of the Curriculum Guide.

RESPONSE TO THE INTERIM AUDIT REPORT

PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

USOE Project No. OEG-0-71-1748 (290)
Title III Sec. 306 ESEA

Ferguson Reorganized School District R-2
Ferguson, Missouri

Submitted by:

Doris M. Stumpe

Doris M. Stumpe
Assistant Superintendent
Elementary Education

May 10, 1974

RESPONSE TO THE INTERIM AUDIT REPORT

We find the Interim Audit Report submitted by Dr. Gary Mohrenweiser of Educational Management Services, Inc., to be an accurate report of his findings during his on-site visit to the project on February 15 and 16, 1974. The report also correctly reflects the evaluation of Dr. Walter L. Hodges, consultant in early education, who visited the project on March 23, 1974.

In response to the report, we would like to make the following comments.

1. We appreciate the remarks stated under general audit findings. We are particularly pleased that the apparent effectiveness of the total program is a result of the coordination of various components and the commitment on the part of both parents and staff.

2. In regard to the use of the home activity guide, we agree that this material is an important part of dissemination. The guides have undergone a yearly revision and, at this point, we believe that they reflect the needs of parent and child and follow our curriculum plan.

3. The comments concerning the curriculum guide state the problem involved in developing a guide which deals with specific objectives and yet provides a comprehensive program. We believe that the various sections of the curriculum guide provide not only the rationale for the program, but ways in which the program may be implemented. Activities for each skill objective are given which emphasize the varied experiences involved and in a sense bring the objective "to life." The means by which the total curriculum works together has been added through a human interest description of the Saturday School Day and the home teaching visit. A section on practical materials used in the program has been added also. Certain objectives have been restated and a few changes were made in the additional skills list which focuses on extending skills for those children who exhibit a readiness for more difficult skill attainment.

In summation, we are pleased with the report of the auditor and appreciate the response to various phases of the Parent-Child Early Education Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES

A Frequency Tabulation of PCEE Pupils' Scores on the Preliminary Screening Battery Administered at the Beginning and End of the Program Year:

A-1 First Project Year
A-2 Second Project Year
A-3 Third Project Year

B Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report:

B-1a First Project Year, Fall
B-1b First Project Year, Spring
B-2a Second Project Year, Fall
B-2b Second Project Year, Spring
B-3a Third Project Year, Fall
B-3b Third Project Year, Spring

C Teacher Ratings of PCEEP and Kindergarten Pupils Self Esteem:

C-1a First Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
C-1b First Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring
C-1c Second Project Year, Kindergarten Pupils, Fall
C-2a Second Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
C-2b Second Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring
C-2c Third Project Year, Kindergarten Pupils, Fall
C-3a Third Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
C-3b Third Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring

D Parent Ratings of Pupils' Behavior on the Items of "My Preschool Child" made Prior to Entry into the PCEE Program and on "My Kindergarten Child" at the time of Entry Into Kindergarten:

D-1 First Project Year Pupils
D-2 Second Project Year Pupils

E Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils on "Introducing My Kindergarten Child:"

E-1 Second Project Year
E-2 Third Project Year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES (continued)

F Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness (STAR):

F-1 Second Project Year
F-2 Third Project Year

G Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering First Grade Pupils on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II (SESAT)

H Percentile Rank Norms Developed for Entering Kindergarten Pupils on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness (STAR); for First Grade Students on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), Level II; and for Second Grade Pupils on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Level I:

H-1a STAR Subtests
H-1b STAR Totals
H-1c STAR Summary
H-2a SESAT, Level II Subtests
H-2b SESAT, Level II First Four Subtests
H-3a SESAT, Level 1 Subtests
H-3b SESAT, Level 1 Combined Subtests
H-3c SESAT, Level 1 Total Reading and Total Battery

Teacher Ratings of Pupils Skill Development:

H-4 First Project Year
H-5 Second Project Year
H-6 Third Project Year

H-7 Initial Parent Ratings of Pupils Behavior on the Items of "My Preschool Child" - Third Project Year

H-8 Results of Analyses of Variance for Kindergarten Pupils on Items of the Kindergarten Home Teaching Report.

I Teacher Ratings of Parents' Performance:

I-1 First Project Year
I-2 Second Project Year
I-3 Third Project Year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES (continued)

K Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings at Saturday School and at Midyear Home Visits by Project Director and Midyear Ratings by Principals:

    K-1 First Project Year
    K-2 Second Project Year
    K-3 Third Project Year

L Frequency Tabulation of Parents' Ratings of Both PCEE Program and Teachers:

    L-1 Second Project Year
    L-2 Third Project Year

M Frequency Distributions of Further Diagnostic Screening Test Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Learning Disabled:

    M-1 First Project Year
    M-2 Second Project Year
    M-3 Third Project Year

N Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" and "Kindergarten Adjustment Scale:"

    N-1a First Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
    N-1b First Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring
    N-1c Second Project Year, Kindergarten Pupils
    N-2a Second Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
    N-2b Second Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring
    N-2c Third Project Year, Kindergarten Pupils
    N-3a Third Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Fall
    N-3b Third Project Year, PCEEP Pupils, Spring

O Frequency Distributions of Further Screening Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Mentally Retarded:

    O-1 First Project Year
    O-2 Second Project Year
    O-3 Third Project Year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES (continued)

P Final Report, Sub-Component for the Emotionally Handicapped, Sidney Kasper, Ph.D.

Q Final Report, Sub-Component for the Mentally Retarded, Allan Yater, Ph.D.

R Final Report, Clinical Audiology, Sidney L. Schoenfeld

APPENDIX A-1

Frequency Tabulations of PCEE Pupils' Scores on The Preliminary Screening Battery Administered at the Beginning and End of The Program Year: Slosson Intelligence Test, Sievers Differential Language Facility Test (Subtest 3), and the Beery Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration*

Scores in Months	Slosson (M.A.)		Sievers (L.A.)		Beery (P.A.)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
30 or less	15		50			
31-32						
33-34	1		14	1	45	3
35-36	1		20		27	2
37-38	3				67	7
39-40	4	1	18	2	1	
41-42	6		35	6	1	
43-44	4					
45-46	10	1	68	7	35	3
47-48	13	3	86	23		
49-50	25	1			86	17
51-52	33		124	50	96	38
53-54	44	4	85	68	49	34
55-56	48	10			41	35
57-58	66	6	74	63	68	51
59-60	69	9	70	68	104	122
61-62	82	18				1
63-64	68	27	49	76	92	165
65-66	73	35	30	54	30	55
67-68	56	42		1	8	58
69-70	46	49	22	81	13	43
71-72	33	55	27	73	10	25
73-74	27	50			2	20
75-76	22	69	12	58		
77-78	12	43	6	55	5	22
79-80	9	42			1	12
81-82	8	56	2	52	3	10
83-84	6	50		18		1
85-86	6	42			1	12
87-88	2	40			1	7
89-90		27				
91-92	1	16				
93-94		15				6
95-96		9			1	4
97-98		14				
99-100		8				
101-102		6				
103-104		3				3
105 or above		5				1

*At the beginning of the program year five pupils were considered untestable with the Slosson Intelligence Test, six were untestable with the Sievers Test, and eleven pupils were untestable with the Beery Test. The number of pupils tested at the end of the program year was 756, a drop of 42 from the beginning of the year.

APPENDIX A-2

Frequency Tabulation of PCEE Pupils' Scores on the Preliminary Screening Battery Administered at the Beginning and End of the Second Program Year: Slosson Intelligence Test, Northwestern Syntax Scale, and the Beery Test of Visual-Motor Integration* (N = 648)

Scores in Months	Slosson (M.A.)		Northwestern				Beery (P.A.)	
			Receptive (L.A.)		Expressive (L.A.)			
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
20 or less			11	3				
21-22			30	1	19	3		
23-24	7	3	10	1	103	14		
25-26			13	2	12	3		
27-28			19	1	17	4		
29-30			19	4	17	5		
31-32			29	4	18	4		
33-34			40	9	24	7	27	3
35-36			1		23	11	30	
37-38	3		49	15	37	12	50	4
39-40	5		56	12	27	10	1	
41-42	1		49	17	33	15		
43-44	3				34	20		
45-46	7	1	46	29	31	36	46	4
47-48	11		52	39	38	36	3	
49-50	17	1	38	41	36	25	103	20
51-52	23		35	32	26	37	102	34
53-54	28	1	32	47	19	33	69	27
55-56	48	2					40	44
57-58	45	4	44	55	22	38	57	49
59-60	55	9	2		26	34	65	141
61-62	52	20	25	56		1		5
63-64	56	19		4	16	38	35	126
65-66	48	24	17	48	21	39	5	43
67-68	59	36		1		1	7	42
69-70	41	36	7	50	17	51	4	37
71-72	37	39	1	1	2	35	1	30

(continued)

APPENDIX A-2 (continued)

Scores in Months	Slosson (M.A.)		Northwestern Receptive (L.A.)		Northwestern Expressive (L.A.)		Beery (P.A.)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
73-74	28	40	10	62		2	1	11
75-76	22	47	1	1	10	27		
77-78	12	45	8	39	7	34	2	7
79-80	11	33		1				6
81-82	8	43	1	28	2	26		6
83-84	4	38	1	17	1	19		1
85-86	3	47	1	16		2		3
87-88	3	39	1	6	5	7		3
89-90	1	24		3	4	8		
91-92	4	21						
93-94	2	28		3	1	7		
95-96	4	15				2		2
97-98		11				2		
99-100		4						
101-102		6						
103-104		5						
105+		7						

---

* The number of pupils whose scores are represented in this Appendix include only those pupils who were tested twice during the program year.

APPENDIX A-3

Frequency Tabulations of PCEE Pupils' Scores on the Preliminary Screening Battery Administered at the Beginning and End of the Third Program Year: Slosson Intelligence Test, Grammatic Closure Subtest (IPPA), and Beery Visual Motor Integration Test *(N = 692)

	Slosson (M.A.)		ITPA Grammatic Closure Subtest (L.A.)		Beery (P.A.)	
Scores in Months	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
22 or less						
23 - 24	5	2	6	4		
25 - 26	1		3			
27 - 28	1					
29 - 30			3			
31 - 32		1				
33 - 34	1		13	2	37	2
35 - 36	2				22	2
37 - 38	3				68	6
39 - 40	4		11			
41 - 42	3	1	3			
43 - 44	4		33	3		
45 - 46	10		35	12	42	4
47 - 48	18		1			1
49 - 50	21	3	49	20	86	15
51 - 52	17	1			94	26
53 - 54	38	7	49	12	73	22
55 - 56	33	3	41	21	45	27
57 - 58	55	11	42	33	52	36
59 - 60	54	14	64	30	82	100
61 - 62	64	18	60	29		
63 - 64	59	19	57	54	52	175
65 - 66	73	28	34	55	7	52
67 - 68	50	43	40	58	10	57
69 - 70	48	55	45	52	5	32
71 - 72	33	43	33	62	8	38
73 - 74	22	45	17	47	4	29
75 - 76	17	50	2			
77 - 78	14	26	18	55	3	16
79 - 80	9	43	15	43	1	10
81 - 82	7	42			1	13
83 - 84	10	42	8	22		
85 - 86	4	35		2		11
87 - 88	4	41	3	24		9
89 - 90	5	31				
91 - 92		28	4	12		

APPENDIX A-3 (continued)

	Slosson (M.A.)		ITPA Grammatic Closure Subtest (L.A.)		Beery (P. A.)	
Scores in Months	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
93 - 94	1	13				1
95 - 96	1	10	1	14		2
97 - 98		16		11		
99 - 100	1	9				
101 - 102		5		2		
103 - 104		4				6
105 - 106		1		4		
107 - 108						
109 - 110			1	3		
111 +		2	1	6		

*The number of pupils whose scores are represented in this Appendix includes only those pupils who were tested twice during the program year.

APPENDIX B-1a

Initial Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report during Fall, 1971 (N = 798)

	Sample	Ratings**					
Conditions affecting visit		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total*	432 (57%)	147 (19%)	125 (17%)	24 (3%)	27 (3%)	43
	ED	141 (51%)	59 (22%)	52 (19%)	8 (3%)	14 (5%)	15
	NH	236 (61%)	70 (18%)	59 (15%)	13 (3%)	12 (3%)	27
	H	196 (54%)	77 (21%)	66 (18%)	11 (3%)	15 (4%)	16
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	409 (54%)	158 (21%)	130 (17%)	29 (4%)	30 (4%)	42
	ED	138 (51%)	44 (16%)	57 (21%)	17 (6%)	17 (6%)	16
	NH	220 (56%)	94 (24%)	60 (15%)	8 (2%)	10 (3%)	25
	H	189 (52%)	64 (18%)	70 (19%)	21 (6%)	20 (6%)	17
c. Place prepared for teacher to work	Total	441 (59%)	132 (18%)	128 (17%)	22 (3%)	25 (3%)	50
	ED	150 (55%)	58 (21%)	47 (17%)	6 (2%)	13 (5%)	15
	NH	233 (61%)	60 (16%)	64 (17%)	16 (4%)	11 (3%)	33
	H	208 (57%)	72 (20%)	64 (18%)	6 (2%)	14 (4%)	17
Parent participation							
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	462 (61%)	116 (15%)	107 (14%)	30 (4%)	41 (5%)	42
	ED	159 (57%)	41 (15%)	45 (16%)	18 (6%)	11 (4%)	15
	NH	239 (61%)	58 (15%)	58 (15%)	10 (3%)	26 (7%)	26
	H	223 (61%)	58 (16%)	49 (13%)	20 (5%)	15 (4%)	16
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	99 (13%)	101 (13%)	214 (28%)	191 (25%)	152 (20%)	41
	ED	32 (12%)	36 (13%)	76 (28%)	67 (24%)	63 (23%)	15
	NH	55 (14%)	54 (14%)	110 (28%)	98 (25%)	75 (19%)	25
	H	44 (12%)	47 (13%)	104 (28%)	93 (25%)	77 (21%)	16

Continued

APPENDIX B-1a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Parent attitude toward teaching session							
a. Positive vs. negative	Total*	349 (46%)	218 (29%)	159 (21%)	25 (3%)	6 (1%)	41
	ED	106 (39%)	82 (30%)	74 (27%)	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	15
	NH	202 (52%)	104 (27%)	72 (18%)	11 (3%)	3 (1%)	25
	H	147 (40%)	114 (31%)	87 (24%)	14 (4%)	3 (1%)	16
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	353 (47%)	213 (28%)	157 (21%)	26 (3%)	8 (1%)	41
	ED	111 (41%)	81 (30%)	67 (24%)	11 (4%)	4 (1%)	15
	NH	199 (51%)	102 (26%)	74 (19%)	13 (3%)	4 (1%)	25
	H	154 (42%)	111 (30%)	83 (23%)	13 (4%)	4 (1%)	16
c. Self-confident vs. lacking confidence	Total	213 (28%)	232 (31%)	234 (31%)	61 (8%)	17 (2%)	41
	ED	61 (22%)	70 (26%)	98 (36%)	36 (13%)	9 (3%)	15
	NH	127 (32%)	133 (34%)	109 (28%)	17 (4%)	6 (2%)	25
	H	86 (24%)	99 (27%)	125 (34%)	44 (12%)	11 (3%)	16
Parent interaction with child							
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	Total	255 (34%)	254 (34%)	200 (26%)	37 (5%)	10 (1%)	42
	ED	65 (24%)	98 (36%)	90 (33%)	14 (5%)	6 (2%)	16
	NH	163 (42%)	118 (30%)	93 (24%)	14 (4%)	4 (1%)	25
	H	92 (25%)	136 (37%)	107 (29%)	23 (6%)	6 (2%)	17
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Total	143 (19%)	246 (33%)	239 (32%)	106 (14%)	22 (3%)	42
	ED	34 (12%)	81 (30%)	98 (36%)	50 (18%)	10 (4%)	16
	NH	93 (24%)	144 (37%)	112 (29%)	34 (9%)	9 (2%)	25
	H	50 (14%)	102 (28%)	127 (35%)	73 (20%)	13 (4%)	17

Continued

APPENDIX B-1 a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	152 (20%)	256 (34%)	275 (36%)	53 (7%)	20 (3%)	42
	ED	46 (17%)	83 (30%)	106 (39%)	28 (10%)	10 (4%)	16
	NH	88 (22%)	138 (35%)	141 (36%)	17 (4%)	8 (2%)	25
	H	64 (18%)	118 (32%)	134 (37%)	36 (10%)	12 (3%)	17
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	151 (20%)	230 (30%)	291 (38%)	66 (9%)	18 (2%)	42
	ED	45 (16%)	78 (29%)	113 (41%)	25 (9%)	12 (4%)	16
	NH	89 (23%)	119 (30%)	148 (38%)	32 (8%)	4 (1%)	25
	H	62 (17%)	111 (30%)	143 (39%)	34 (9%)	14 (4%)	17
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	188 (25%)	251 (33%)	243 (32%)	66 (9%)	8 (1%)	42
	ED	49 (18%)	82 (30%)	104 (38%)	33 (12%)	5 (2%)	16
	NH	116 (30%)	143 (36%)	114 (29%)	17 (4%)	2 (1%)	25
	H	72 (20%)	108 (30%)	129 (35%)	49 (13%)	6 (2%)	17
Parent relationship with teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	414 (55%)	205 (27%)	125 (17%)	11 (1%)	1 (<1%)	42
	ED	121 (44%)	94 (34%)	51 (19%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	16
	NH	236 (60%)	89 (23%)	64 (16%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	25
	H	178 (49%)	116 (32%)	61 (17%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)	17
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	414 (55%)	190 (25%)	135 (18%)	16 (2%)	1 (<1%)	42
	ED	125 (46%)	77 (28%)	61 (22%)	9 (3%)	1 (<1%)	16
	NH	237 (60%)	87 (22%)	63 (16%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	25
	H	177 (49%)	103 (28%)	72 (20%)	11 (3%)	1 (<1%)	17

Continued

APPENDIX B-1a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	325 (43%)	206 (27%)	188 (25%)	28 (4%)	9 (1%)	42
	ED	91 (33%)	76 (28%)	82 (30%)	17 (6%)	7 (3%)	16
	NH	200 (51%)	103 (26%)	81 (21%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	25
	H	125 (34%)	103 (28%)	107 (29%)	21 (6%)	8 (2%)	17
Child's relationship with teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	198 (26%)	218 (29%)	187 (25%)	117 (15%)	43 (6%)	35
	ED	56 (20%)	64 (23%)	74 (27%)	53 (19%)	29 (11%)	13
	NH	121 (31%)	131 (33%)	92 (23%)	44 (11%)	8 (2%)	21
	H	77 (21%)	87 (24%)	95 (26%)	73 (20%)	35 (10%)	14
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	265 (35%)	233 (31%)	191 (25%)	49 (6%)	25 (3%)	35
	ED	70 (25%)	71 (26%)	96 (35%)	20 (7%)	19 (7%)	13
	NH	169 (43%)	133 (34%)	76 (19%)	15 (4%)	3 (1%)	21
	H	96 (26%)	100 (27%)	115 (31%)	34 (9%)	22 (6%)	14
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	193 (25%)	201 (26%)	186 (24%)	130 (17%)	53 (7%)	35
	ED	55 (20%)	53 (19%)	72 (26%)	63 (23%)	33 (12%)	13
	NH	118 (30%)	126 (32%)	91 (23%)	50 (13%)	11 (3%)	21
	H	75 (20%)	75 (20%)	95 (26%)	80 (22%)	42 (11%)	14

Continued

APPENDIX B-1a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Child's response to learning activities a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	331 (43%)	214 (28%)	171 (22%)	38 (5%)	9 (1%)	35
	ED	97 (35%)	75 (27%)	79 (29%)	18 (7%)	7 (3%)	13
	NH	201 (51%)	111 (28%)	72 (18%)	11 (3%)	1 (<1%)	21
	H	130 (35%)	103 (28%)	99 (27%)	27 (7%)	8 (2%)	14
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	277 (36%)	247 (32%)	167 (22%)	51 (7%)	21 (3%)	35
	ED	81 (29%)	75 (27%)	82 (30%)	23 (8%)	15 (5%)	13
	NH	168 (42%)	140 (35%)	70 (18%)	16 (4%)	2 (1%)	21
	H	109 (30%)	107 (29%)	97 (26%)	35 (10%)	19 (5%)	14
c. Attained all vs. none of the objectives	Total	212 (28%)	294 (39%)	187 (25%)	60 (8%)	10 (1%)	35
	ED	78 (28%)	86 (31%)	74 (27%)	31 (11%)	7 (3%)	13
	NH	106 (27%)	182 (46%)	92 (23%)	15 (4%)	1 (<1%)	21
	H	106 (29%)	112 (31%)	95 (26%)	45 (12%)	9 (2%)	14
Child's attitude toward Saturday School Positive vs. negative	Total	313 (41%)	221 (29%)	171 (23%)	40 (5%)	15 (2%)	38
	ED	89 (32%)	74 (27%)	75 (27%)	26 (9%)	12 (4%)	13
	NH	184 (46%)	123 (31%)	74 (19%)	11 (3%)	2 (1%)	23
	H	129 (35%)	98 (27%)	97 (27%)	29 (8%)	13 (4%)	15

Continued

APPENDIX B-1a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings			
Indications of parent follow-up of Saturday School or previous visit***		Two or more samples	One	None	Blank
a. Displayed child's work	Total	102 (14%)	246 (33%)	407 (54%)	43
	ED	30 (11%)	93 (35%)	151 (55%)	15
	NH	61 (16%)	126 (32%)	203 (52%)	27
	H	41 (11%)	120 (33%)	204 (56%)	16
		Several	One	None	Blank
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	149 (20%)	243 (32%)	363 (48%)	43
	ED	50 (18%)	77 (28%)	147 (54%)	15
	NH	75 (19%)	145 (37%)	170 (44%)	27
	H	74 (20%)	98 (27%)	193 (53%)	16
c. Initiated teaching of new or related activities	Total	111 (15%)	167 (22%)	477 (63%)	43
	ED	39 (14%)	50 (18%)	185 (68%)	15
	NH	53 (14%)	99 (25%)	238 (61%)	27
	H	58 (16%)	68 (19%)	239 (65%)	16

Continued

APPENDIX B-1a (continued)

*Total represents 798 pupils evaluated.
ED represents 299 pupils rated as having emotional disturbances.
NH represents 417 pupils rated as having no handicap.
H represents 381 pupils rated as having special problems or handicaps.

**Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

***Data on the following three items were collected from the first or second home visit as few parents were given materials or instructions before the first home visit.

APPENDIX B-1b

Final Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report during Spring, 1972 (N=797)

	Sample	Ratings**				
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Conditions affecting visit							
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total*	572 (81%)	59 (8%)	47 (7%)	8 (1%)	22 (3%)	89
	ED	168 (75%)	19 (9%)	23 (10%)	5 (2%)	8 (4%)	20
	NH	321 (83%)	32 (8%)	21 (5%)	3 (1%)	9 (2%)	64
	H	251 (78%)	27 (8%)	26 (8%)	5 (2%)	13 (4%)	25
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	578 (81%)	67 (9%)	46 (6%)	7 (1%)	17 (2%)	82
	ED	175 (77%)	19 (8%)	21 (9%)	5 (2%)	7 (3%)	16
	NH	322 (83%)	37 (10%)	18 (5%)	2 (1%)	8 (2%)	63
	H	256 (78%)	30 (9%)	28 (9%)	5 (2%)	9 (3%)	19
c. Place prepared for teacher to work	Total	597 (85%)	45 (6%)	44 (6%)	5 (1%)	12 (2%)	94
	ED	175 (80%)	18 (8%)	19 (9%)	3 (1%)	5 (2%)	23
	NH	338 (88%)	18 (5%)	23 (6%)	1 (<1%)	4 (1%)	66
	H	259 (81%)	27 (8%)	21 (7%)	4 (1%)	8 (3%)	28
Parent partic.							
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	492 (70%)	102 (14%)	51 (7%)	31 (4%)	31 (4%)	90
	ED	147 (65%)	36 (16%)	19 (8%)	11 (5%)	12 (5%)	18
	NH	274 (72%)	57 (15%)	23 (6%)	17 (4%)	12 (3%)	67
	H	218 (67%)	45 (14%)	28 (9%)	14 (4%)	19 (6%)	23
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	202 (29%)	161 (23%)	153 (22%)	109 (15%)	81 (11%)	91
	ED	59 (26%)	59 (26%)	45 (20%)	28 (13%)	33 (15%)	19
	NH	114 (30%)	81 (21%)	92 (24%)	60 (16%)	37 (10%)	66
	H	88 (27%)	80 (25%)	61 (19%)	49 (15%)	44 (14%)	25

Continued

APPENDIX B-1b (Contd.)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Parent attitude toward teaching session							
a. Positive vs. negative	Total	510 (71%)	142 (20%)	57 (8%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	83
	ED	152 (67%)	47 (21%)	25 (11%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	284 (73%)	74 (19%)	28 (7%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	62
	H	226 (69%)	68 (21%)	29 (9%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	21
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	504 (71%)	139 (19%)	56 (8%)	11 (2%)	3 (<1%)	84
	ED	148 (65%)	52 (23%)	22 (10%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	17
	NH	279 (72%)	72 (19%)	28 (7%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	63
	H	225 (69%)	67 (21%)	28 (9%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	21
c. Self-confident vs. lacking self-confidence	Total	429 (60%)	183 (26%)	91 (13%)	9 (1%)	1 (<1%)	84
	ED	128 (57%)	59 (26%)	35 (15%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	246 (64%)	90 (23%)	47 (12%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	183 (56%)	93 (29%)	44 (13%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	21
Parent interaction with child							
a. Accepting vs. unaccepting	Total	455 (64%)	180 (25%)	72 (10%)	6 (1%)	0 (0%)	84
	ED	132 (58%)	61 (27%)	31 (14%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	263 (68%)	91 (24%)	30 (8%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	192 (59%)	89 (27%)	42 (13%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	21
b. Aware of needs vs. unaware of needs	Total	353 (50%)	183 (26%)	160 (22%)	16 (2%)	1 (<1%)	84
	ED	91 (40%)	65 (29%)	63 (28%)	7 (3%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	218 (56%)	92 (24%)	69 (18%)	8 (2%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	135 (41%)	91 (28%)	91 (28%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)	21
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	366 (51%)	219 (31%)	112 (16%)	14 (2%)	2 (<1%)	84
	ED	97 (43%)	83 (37%)	41 (18%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	220 (57%)	102 (26%)	57 (15%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	63
	H	146 (45%)	117 (36%)	55 (17%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	21

Continued

APPENDIX B-1b (Contd.)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	360 (50%)	225 (32%)	114 (16%)	12 (2%)	2 (<1%)	84
	ED	97 (43%)	85 (38%)	40 (18%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	17
	NH	208 (54%)	112 (29%)	59 (15%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	63
	H	152 (47%)	113 (35%)	55 (17%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	21
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	414 (58%)	193 (27%)	98 (14%)	6 (1%)	2 (<1%)	84
	ED	109 (48%)	74 (33%)	39 (17%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	17
	NH	249 (64%)	91 (24%)	44 (11%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	165 (51%)	102 (31%)	54 (17%)	3 (1%)	2 (1%)	21
Parent relationship with teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	590 (83%)	87 (12%)	35 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	84
	ED	177 (78%)	31 (14%)	17 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	17
	NH	320 (83%)	51 (13%)	16 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	270 (83%)	36 (11%)	19 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	21
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	546 (77%)	105 (15%)	53 (7%)	5 (1%)	4 (1%)	84
	ED	160 (71%)	35 (15%)	27 (12%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	17
	NH	301 (78%)	58 (15%)	23 (6%)	4 (1%)	1 (<1%)	63
	H	245 (75%)	47 (14%)	30 (9%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	21
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	520 (73%)	130 (18%)	55 (8%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	85
	ED	153 (68%)	49 (22%)	22 (10%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	18
	NH	287 (74%)	65 (17%)	29 (7%)	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	63
	H	233 (72%)	65 (20%)	26 (8%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	22
Child's relationship with teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	389 (53%)	229 (31%)	89 (12%)	17 (2%)	6 (1%)	67
	ED	107 (47%)	79 (34%)	31 (14%)	9 (4%)	3 (1%)	14
	NH	232 (58%)	115 (29%)	41 (10%)	8 (2%)	3 (1%)	51
	H	157 (47%)	114 (34%)	48 (15%)	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	16

Continued

APPENDIX B-1b (Contd.)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	464 (64%)	205 (28%)	47 (6%)	11 (2%)	3 (<1%)	67
	ED	123 (54%)	78 (34%)	19 (8%)	7 (3%)	2 (1%)	14
	NH	275 (69%)	102 (26%)	20 (5%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	51
	H	189 (57%)	103 (31%)	27 (8%)	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	16
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	388 (53%)	211 (29%)	100 (14%)	25 (3%)	6 (1%)	67
	ED	110 (48%)	70 (31%)	34 (15%)	12 (5%)	3 (1%)	14
	NH	232 (58%)	104 (26%)	48 (12%)	12 (3%)	3 (1%)	51
	H	156 (47%)	107 (32%)	52 (16%)	13 (4%)	3 (1%)	16
Child's response to learning activ.							
a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	553 (76%)	143 (20%)	27 (4%)	5 (1%)	2 (<1%)	67
	ED	166 (72%)	45 (20%)	14 (6%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	14
	NH	308 (77%)	79 (20%)	10 (3%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	51
	H	245 (74%)	64 (19%)	17 (5%)	4 (1%)	1 (<1%)	16
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	502 (69%)	172 (24%)	42 (6%)	11 (2%)	3 (<1%)	67
	ED	143 (62%)	59 (26%)	19 (8%)	7 (3%)	1 (<1%)	14
	NH	286 (72%)	92 (23%)	18 (5%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	51
	H	216 (65%)	80 (24%)	24 (7%)	9 (3%)	2 (1%)	16
c. Attained objectives: all vs. none	Total	467 (64%)	199 (27%)	53 (7%)	9 (1%)	2 (<1%)	67
	ED	145 (63%)	61 (27%)	19 (8%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	14
	NH	262 (66%)	108 (27%)	25 (6%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	51
	H	205 (62%)	91 (27%)	28 (8%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	16
Child's attitude toward Saturday School: positive vs. negative	Total	550 (75%)	136 (19%)	40 (5%)	3 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	67
	ED	162 (71%)	47 (21%)	17 (7%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	14
	NH	307 (77%)	72 (18%)	19 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	51
	H	243 (73%)	64 (19%)	21 (6%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	16

Continued

APPENDIX B-1b (Contd.)

Indications of parent follow-up of Sat. Sch. or previous visit		Two or more samples	One	None	Blank
a. Displayed child's work	Total	198 (28%)	293 (42%)	209 (30%)	97
	ED	71 (32%)	83 (38%)	65 (30%)	24
	NH	103 (27%)	172 (45%)	109 (28%)	66
	H	95 (30%)	121 (38%)	100 (32%)	31
		Several	One	None	Blank
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	203 (29%)	317 (45%)	181 (26%)	96
	ED	66 (30%)	84 (38%)	70 (32%)	23
	NH	101 (26%)	196 (51%)	87 (23%)	66
	H	102 (32%)	121 (38%)	94 (30%)	30
c. Initiated teaching of new or related activities	Total	158 (23%)	244 (35%)	300 (43%)	95
	ED	38 (17%)	75 (34%)	107 (49%)	23
	NH	101 (26%)	134 (35%)	150 (39%)	65
	H	57 (18%)	110 (35%)	150 (47%)	30

*Total represents 797 pupils evaluated.
ED represents 243 pupils identified as having emotional disturbances.
NH represents 450 pupils identified as having no handicap.
H represents 347 pupils identified as having special problems or handicaps.

**Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX B-2a

Initial Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report during Fall, 1972 (N = 640)

	Sample*	Ratings**					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Conditions affecting visit							
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total	522 (82%)	50 (8%)	38 (6%)	3 (<1%)	25 (4%)	2
	H	220 (78%)	22 (8%)	23 (8%)	1 (<1%)	15 (5%)	0
	NH	283 (85%)	27 (8%)	12 (4%)	2 (1%)	10 (3%)	2
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	470 (74%)	74 (12%)	55 (9%)	10 (2%)	29 (5%)	2
	H	194 (69%)	33 (12%)	32 (11%)	4 (1%)	18 (6%)	0
	NH	257 (77%)	39 (12%)	21 (6%)	6 (2%)	11 (3%)	2
c. Place prepared for teacher to work	Total	514 (81%)	40 (6%)	56 (9%)	7 (1%)	21 (3%)	2
	H	222 (79%)	16 (6%)	27 (10%)	4 (1%)	12 (4%)	0
	NH	274 (82%)	23 (7%)	26 (8%)	3 (1%)	8 (2%)	2
Parent Partic.							
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	530 (83%)	56 (9%)	28 (4%)	10 (2%)	15 (2%)	1
	H	222 (79%)	24 (9%)	17 (6%)	7 (2%)	11 (4%)	0
	NH	289 (86%)	28 (8%)	11 (3%)	3 (1%)	4 (1%)	1
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	371 (58%)	99 (15%)	105 (16%)	32 (5%)	32 (5%)	1
	H	141 (50%)	48 (17%)	53 (19%)	18 (6%)	21 (7%)	0
	NH	216 (64%)	46 (14%)	49 (15%)	13 (4%)	11 (3%)	1
Parent attitude toward teaching session							
a. Positive vs. negative	Total	470 (74%)	89 (14%)	69 (11%)	7 (1%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	224 (80%)	37 (13%)	16 (6%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	256 (77%)	48 (14%)	28 (8%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	2

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	468 (73%)	91 (14%)	68 (11%)	8 (1%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	200 (71%)	34 (12%)	40 (14%)	4 (1%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	253 (76%)	50 (15%)	27 (8%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	2
c. Self-confident vs. lacking self-confidence	Total	385 (60%)	132 (21%)	99 (16%)	13 (2%)	8 (1%)	3
	H	155 (55%)	50 (18%)	60 (21%)	10 (4%)	5 (2%)	1
	NH	219 (66%)	72 (22%)	37 (11%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
Parent Interaction with child							
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	Total	439 (69%)	106 (17%)	73 (11%)	17 (3%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	173 (62%)	47 (17%)	45 (16%)	13 (5%)	2 (<1%)	1
	NH	251 (75%)	52 (16%)	27 (8%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	2
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Total	317 (50%)	173 (27%)	95 (15%)	42 (7%)	10 (2%)	3
	H	119 (42%)	71 (25%)	53 (19%)	30 (11%)	7 (2%)	1
	NH	188 (56%)	92 (28%)	39 (12%)	12 (4%)	3 (1%)	2
	ED	83 (40%)	55 (26%)	41 (20%)	25 (12%)	6 (3%)	0
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	357 (56%)	144 (23%)	113 (18%)	19 (3%)	4 (1%)	3
	H	133 (48%)	65 (23%)	66 (24%)	13 (5%)	3 (1%)	1
	NH	213 (64%)	71 (21%)	44 (13%)	5 (1%)	1 (<1%)	2
	ED	97 (46%)	48 (23%)	51 (24%)	11 (5%)	3 (1%)	0
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	365 (57%)	138 (22%)	108 (17%)	22 (3%)	4 (1%)	3
	H	140 (50%)	60 (21%)	63 (22%)	14 (5%)	3 (1%)	1
	NH	212 (63%)	72 (22%)	42 (13%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	2
	ED	100 (48%)	46 (22%)	49 (23%)	12 (6%)	3 (1%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	377 (59%)	132 (21%)	112 (18%)	13 (2%)	3 (<1%)	3
	H	142 (51%)	57 (20%)	69 (25%)	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	1
	NH	221 (66%)	70 (21%)	39 (12%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	2
Parent relationship with teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	495 (78%)	72 (11%)	63 (10%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	3
	H	205 (73%)	32 (11%)	40 (14%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	1
	NH	272 (81%)	35 (10%)	23 (7%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	2
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	492 (77%)	67 (11%)	72 (11%)	5 (1%)	1 (<1%)	3
	H	207 (74%)	26 (9%)	41 (15%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1
	NH	268 (80%)	37 (11%)	29 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	425 (67%)	110 (17%)	87 (14%)	13 (2%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	171 (61%)	47 (17%)	53 (19%)	7 (2%)	2 (<1%)	1
	NH	240 (72%)	56 (17%)	32 (10%)	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	2
Child's relationship with teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	278 (43%)	171 (27%)	97 (15%)	55 (9%)	39 (6%)	0
	H	108 (38%)	59 (21%)	58 (21%)	30 (11%)	26 (9%)	0
	NH	158 (47%)	104 (31%)	37 (11%)	24 (7%)	13 (4%)	0
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	375 (59%)	143 (22%)	73 (11%)	31 (5%)	18 (3%)	0
	H	142 (51%)	62 (22%)	41 (15%)	22 (8%)	14 (5%)	0
	NH	220 (65%)	74 (22%)	29 (9%)	9 (3%)	4 (1%)	0
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	271 (42%)	157 (25%)	123 (19%)	59 (9%)	30 (5%)	0
	H	107 (38%)	59 (21%)	59 (21%)	36 (13%)	20 (7%)	0
	NH	153 (46%)	91 (3%)	61 (18%)	22 (7%)	9 (3%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Child's response to learning activities							
a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	412 (64%)	142 (22%)	68 (11%)	10 (2%)	8 (1%)	0
	H	156 (56%)	67 (24%)	44 (16%)	9 (3%)	5 (2%)	0
	NH	239 (71%)	71 (21%)	22 (7%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	0
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	370 (58%)	150 (23%)	79 (12%)	28 (4%)	13 (2%)	0
	H	132 (47%)	67 (24%)	51 (18%)	20 (7%)	11 (4%)	0
	NH	223 (66%)	78 (23%)	25 (7%)	8 (2%)	2 (1%)	0
c. Attained all vs. none of the objectives	Total	309 (48%)	171 (27%)	124 (19%)	24 (4%)	12 (2%)	0
	H	112 (40%)	71 (25%)	68 (24%)	22 (8%)	8 (3%)	0
	NH	185 (55%)	94 (28%)	51 (15%)	2 (1%)	4 (1%)	0
Child's attitude toward Saturday School: positive vs. neg.	Total	402 (63%)	119 (19%)	85 (13%)	19 (3%)	15 (2%)	0
	H	150 (53%)	52 (19%)	53 (19%)	13 (5%)	13 (5%)	0
	NH	238 (71%)	62 (18%)	28 (8%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	0
Indications of parent follow-up of Sat. School or previous visit							
		Two or more samples		One	None		Blank
a. Displayed child's work	Total	164 (26%)		186 (29%)	288 (45%)		2
	H	74 (26%)		74 (26%)	133 (47%)		0
	NH	83 (25%)		107 (32%)	144 (43%)		2

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2a (continued)

	Sample	Ratings			
		Several	One	None	Blank
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	163 (26%)	183 (29%)	292 (46%)	2
	H	78 (28%)	82 (29%)	121 (43%)	0
	NH	77 (23%)	97 (29%)	160 (48%)	2
c. Initiated teaching new or related activities	Total	120 (19%)	160 (25%)	357 (56%)	3
	H	54 (19%)	62 (22%)	164 (59%)	1
	NH	61 (18%)	90 (27%)	183 (55%)	2

* Total represents 640 pupils evaluated twice

H represents 281 pupils rated twice who were identified as having special problems or handicaps both at the beginning and end of the program year

NH represents 336 pupils rated twice who were identified as having no handicap both initially and finally

ED represents 210 parents of pupils rated twice who were identified as having emotional problems both initially and finally

** Numbers above columns eachrefer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX B-2b

Final Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report During Spring, 1972 (N = 640)

	Sample*	Ratings**					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Conditions affecting visit							
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total	582 (91%)	14 (2%)	14 (2%)	6 (1%)	22 (3%)	2
	H	250 (89%)	8 (3%)	9 (3%)	4 (1%)	10 (4%)	0
	NH	311 (93%)	6 (2%)	5 (1%)	2 (1%)	10 (3%)	2
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	580 (91%)	31 (5%)	12 (2%)	2 (<1%)	13 (2%)	2
	H	246 (88%)	17 (6%)	11 (4%)	1 (<1%)	6 (2%)	0
	NH	312 (93%)	14 (4%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	6 (2%)	2
c. Place prepared for teacher to work	Total	592 (93%)	14 (2%)	17 (3%)	3 (<1%)	12 (2%)	2
	H	253 (90%)	7 (2%)	11 (4%)	3 (1%)	7 (2%)	0
	NH	318 (95%)	7 (2%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	2
Parent Partic.							
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	554 (87%)	31 (5%)	24 (4%)	11 (2%)	19 (3%)	1
	H	239 (85%)	14 (5%)	11 (4%)	7 (2%)	10 (4%)	0
	NH	294 (88%)	17 (5%)	13 (4%)	3 (1%)	8 (2%)	1
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	434 (68%)	79 (12%)	75 (12%)	25 (4%)	26 (4%)	1
	H	184 (65%)	33 (12%)	32 (11%)	18 (6%)	14 (5%)	0
	NH	231 (69%)	46 (14%)	41 (12%)	6 (2%)	11 (3%)	1
Parent attitude toward teaching session							
a. Positive vs. negative	Total	526 (83%)	79 (12%)	25 (4%)	1 (<1%)	6 (1%)	3
	H	224 (80%)	37 (13%)	16 (6%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	284 (85%)	39 (12%)	7 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	2

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2b (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	520 (82%)	77 (12%)	32 (5%)	1 (<1%)	7 (1%)	3
	H	221 (79%)	37 (13%)	19 (7%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	1
	NH	282 (84%)	36 (11%)	11 (3%)	1 (<1%)	4 (1%)	2
c. Self-confident vs. lacking self-confidence	Total	475 (75%)	103 (16%)	47 (7%)	5 (1%)	7 (1%)	3
	H	195 (70%)	52 (19%)	26 (9%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	263 (79%)	47 (14%)	19 (6%)	0 (0%)	5 (1%)	2
Parent Interaction with child							
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	Total	469 (74%)	121 (19%)	37 (6%)	7 (1%)	3 (<1%)	3
	H	187 (67%)	68 (24%)	18 (6%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1
	NH	264 (79%)	51 (15%)	16 (5%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	2
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Total	389 (61%)	165 (26%)	65 (10%)	12 (2%)	6 (1%)	3
	H	148 (53%)	80 (29%)	42 (15%)	7 (2%)	3 (1%)	1
	NH	225 (67%)	81 (24%)	20 (6%)	5 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
	ED	111 (53%)	61 (29%)	30 (14%)	5 (2%)	3 (1%)	0
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	415 (65%)	151 (24%)	59 (9%)	7 (1%)	5 (1%)	3
	H	164 (59%)	79 (28%)	29 (10%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	234 (70%)	69 (21%)	27 (8%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	2
	ED	122 (58%)	60 (29%)	21 (10%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	0
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	410 (64%)	156 (24%)	57 (9%)	9 (1%)	5 (1%)	3
	H	161 (58%)	80 (29%)	30 (11%)	7 (2%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	232 (69%)	73 (22%)	24 (7%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
	ED	121 (58%)	61 (29%)	20 (10%)	6 (3%)	2 (1%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2b (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	460 (72%)	117 (18%)	48 (8%)	8 (1%)	4 (1%)	3
	H	186 (66%)	62 (22%)	26 (9%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1
	NH	257 (77%)	53 (16%)	19 (6%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
Parent relationship with teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	553 (87%)	63 (10%)	17 (3%)	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	235 (84%)	35 (12%)	8 (3%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	1
	NH	300 (90%)	25 (7%)	7 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	2
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	529 (83%)	79 (12%)	24 (4%)	2 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	3
	H	224 (80%)	39 (14%)	14 (5%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	287 (86%)	37 (11%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	2
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	506 (79%)	97 (15%)	28 (4%)	3 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	3
	H	207 (74%)	56 (20%)	13 (5%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	1
	NH	281 (84%)	38 (11%)	13 (4%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	2
Child's relationship with teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	419 (65%)	147 (23%)	54 (8%)	8 (1%)	12 (2%)	0
	H	157 (56%)	77 (27%)	32 (11%)	6 (2%)	9 (3%)	0
	NH	246 (73%)	66 (20%)	19 (6%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	0
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	462 (72%)	121 (19%)	47 (7%)	7 (1%)	3 (<1%)	0
	H	174 (62%)	72 (26%)	27 (10%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	0
	NH	271 (81%)	45 (13%)	18 (5%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	405 (63%)	166 (26%)	51 (8%)	13 (2%)	5 (1%)	0
	H	156 (56%)	84 (30%)	28 (10%)	9 (3%)	4 (1%)	0
	NH	236 (70%)	74 (22%)	21 (6%)	4 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-2b (continued)

	Sample	Ratings					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Child's response to learning activities							
a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	525 (82%)	86 (13%)	24 (4%)	3 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	0
	H	215 (77%)	48 (17%)	15 (5%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
	NH	291 (87%)	35 (10%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	451 (70%)	135 (21%)	48 (8%)	3 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	0
	H	174 (62%)	74 (26%)	30 (11%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
	NH	262 (78%)	55 (16%)	16 (5%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	0
c. Attained all vs. none of the objectives	Total	450 (70%)	140 (22%)	41 (6%)	7 (1%)	2 (<1%)	0
	H	178 (63%)	73 (26%)	24 (9%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0
	NH	254 (76%)	63 (19%)	16 (5%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
Child's attitude toward Saturday School: positive vs. neg.	Total	520 (81%)	88 (14%)	25 (4%)	3 (<1%)	4 (1%)	0
	H	204 (73%)	53 (19%)	19 (7%)	3 (1%)	2 (1%)	0
	NH	296 (88%)	32 (10%)	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0
Indications of parent follow-up of Sat. School or previous visit		Two or more samples	One	None	Blank		
a. Displayed child's work	Total	312 (49%)	199 (31%)	127 (20%)	2		
	H	131 (47%)	87 (31%)	63 (22%)	0		
	NH	171 (51%)	104 (31%)	59 (18%)	2		

APPENDIX B-2b (continued)

	Sample	Ratings			
		Two or Several	One	None	Blank
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	273 (43%)	236 (37%)	129 (20%)	2
	H	115 (41%)	105 (37%)	61 (22%)	0
	NH	149 (45%)	126 (38%)	59 (18%)	2
c. Initiated teaching new or related activities	Total	199 (31%)	186 (29%)	252 (40%)	3
	H	82 (29%)	78 (28%)	120 (43%)	1
	NH	110 (33%)	102 (31%)	122 (37%)	2

* Total represents 640 pupils evaluated twice.
H represents 281 pupils rated twice who were identified as having special problems or handicaps both at the beginning and end of the program year.
NH represents 336 pupils rated twice who were identified as having no handicap both initially and finally.
ED represents 210 pupils rated twice who were identified as having emotional problems both initially and finally.

**Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX B-3a

Initial Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report During Fall, 1973 (N = 658)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings**									
Conditions affecting visit		5		4		3		2		1	Blank
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total	558	(86%)	51	(8%)	16	(3%)	9	(1%)	14	(2%)	10
	H	314	(83%)	39	(10%)	11	(3%)	8	(2%)	6	(2%)	7
	NH	244	(90%)	12	(4%)	5	(2%)	1	(<1%)	8	(3%)	3
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	538	(82%)	62	(10%)	24	(4%)	8	(1%)	17	(3%)	9
	H	298	(79%)	48	(13%)	16	(4%)	8	(2%)	8	(2%)	7
	NH	240	(89%)	14	(5%)	8	(3%)	0	(0%)	9	(3%)	2
c. Place prepared for teacher to work	Total	555	(86%)	43	(7%)	25	(4%)	10	(2%)	16	(2%)	9
	H	314	(83%)	32	(8%)	18	(5%)	7	(2%)	7	(2%)	7
	NH	241	(89%)	11	(4%)	7	(3%)	3	(1%)	9	(3%)	2
Parent Participation												
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	558	(86%)	60	(9%)	18	(3%)	8	(1%)	7	(1%)	7
	H	321	(84%)	36	(10%)	11	(3%)	6	(2%)	6	(2%)	5
	NH	236	(87%)	24	(9%)	7	(3%)	2	(1%)	2	(1%)	2
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	379	(58%)	103	(16%)	112	(17%)	43	(7%)	14	(2%)	7
	H	208	(55%)	66	(17%)	62	(16%)	32	(8%)	12	(3%)	5
	NH	172	(64%)	36	(13%)	50	(18%)	11	(4%)	2	(1%)	2
Parent Attitude toward Teaching Session												
a. Positive vs. negative	Total	460	(71%)	147	(23%)	33	(5%)	10	(2%)	0	(0%)	8
	H	258	(68%)	90	(24%)	26	(7%)	6	(2%)	0	(0%)	5
	NH	202	(75%)	57	(21%)	7	(3%)	4	(2%)	0	(0%)	3
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	469	(72%)	132	(20%)	36	(6%)	13	(2%)	0	(0%)	8
	H	265	(70%)	84	(22%)	23	(6%)	8	(2%)	0	(0%)	5
	NH	204	(76%)	48	(18%)	13	(5%)	5	(2%)	0	(0%)	3

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3a (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings** 5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. Self-confident vs. lacking confidence	Total	395 (61%)	158 (24%)	77 (12%)	15 (2%)	5 (1%)	8
	H	201 (53%)	104 (27%)	59 (16%)	13 (3%)	3 (1%)	5
	NH	194 (72%)	54 (20%)	18 (7%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	3
Parent Interaction with child							
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	Total	412 (63%)	159 (24%)	65 (10%)	13 (2%)	1 (<1%)	8
	H	212 (56%)	107 (28%)	52 (14%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)	5
	NH	199 (74%)	53 (20%)	13 (5%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	3
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Total	338 (52%)	143 (22%)	113 (17%)	45 (7%)	11 (2%)	8
	H	158 (42%)	99 (26%)	75 (20%)	38 (10%)	10 (3%)	5
	NH	180 (68%)	44 (16%)	38 (14%)	7 (3%)	1 (<1%)	3
	ED	85 (39%)	48 (22%)	54 (25%)	24 (11%)	7 (3%)	0
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	363 (56%)	154 (24%)	95 (15%)	32 (5%)	6 (1%)	8
	H	182 (48%)	93 (24%)	75 (20%)	26 (7%)	4 (1%)	5
	NH	181 (67%)	61 (23%)	20 (7%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	3
	ED	94 (43%)	54 (25%)	51 (23%)	17 (8%)	2 (1%)	0
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	357 (55%)	161 (25%)	94 (14%)	31 (5%)	7 (1%)	8
	H	181 (48%)	98 (26%)	72 (19%)	24 (6%)	5 (1%)	5
	NH	176 (65%)	63 (23%)	22 (8%)	7 (3%)	2 (1%)	3
	ED	94 (43%)	57 (26%)	49 (22%)	16 (7%)	2 (1%)	0
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	377 (58%)	154 (24%)	91 (14%)	26 (4%)	2 (<1%)	8
	H	191 (50%)	95 (25%)	71 (19%)	21 (6%)	2 (<1%)	5
	NH	186 (69%)	59 (22%)	20 (7%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	3
Parent Relationship with Teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	507 (78%)	105 (16%)	31 (5%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	8
	H	292 (77%)	63 (17%)	21 (6%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	5
	NH	215 (80%)	42 (16%)	10 (4%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	3

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3a (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings** 5	4	3	2	1	Blank
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	491 (76%)	109 (17%)	40 (6%)	9 (1%)	1 (<1%)	8
	H	282 (74%)	66 (17%)	27 (7%)	4 (1%)	1 (<1%)	5
	NH	209 (77%)	43 (16%)	13 (5%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)	3
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	427 (66%)	138 (21%)	69 (11%)	12 (2%)	4 (1%)	8
	H	225 (59%)	91 (24%)	53 (14%)	8 (2%)	3 (1%)	5
	NH	202 (75%)	47 (17%)	16 (6%)	4 (2%)	1 (<1%)	3
Child's Relationship with Teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	279 (42%)	184 (28%)	118 (18%)	41 (6%)	36 (6%)	0
	H	153 (40%)	103 (27%)	67 (17%)	33 (9%)	29 (8%)	0
	NH	127 (46%)	80 (30%)	51 (19%)	8 (3%)	7 (3%)	0
b. Cooperative vs. Uncooperative	Total	389 (59%)	153 (23%)	74 (11%)	32 (5%)	10 (2%)	0
	H	197 (51%)	96 (25%)	58 (15%)	25 (6%)	9 (2%)	0
	NH	192 (70%)	57 (21%)	16 (6%)	7 (3%)	1 (<1%)	0
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	273 (42%)	177 (27%)	129 (20%)	43 (6%)	35 (5%)	1
	H	146 (38%)	98 (26%)	81 (21%)	28 (7%)	31 (8%)	1
	NH	127 (46%)	79 (29%)	48 (18%)	15 (6%)	4 (2%)	0
Child's Response to Learning Activities							
a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	434 (66%)	166 (25%)	49 (7%)	6 (1%)	3 (<1%)	0
	H	227 (59%)	110 (29%)	42 (11%)	4 (1%)	2 (<1%)	0
	NH	207 (76%)	56 (21%)	7 (3%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	397 (60%)	154 (23%)	82 (12%)	18 (3%)	7 (1%)	0
	H	193 (50%)	102 (26%)	70 (18%)	14 (4%)	6 (2%)	0
	NH	203 (74%)	53 (19%)	12 (4%)	4 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3a (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings**					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. Attained all vs. none of objectives	Total	407 (62%)	145 (22%)	82 (12%)	20 (3%)	4 (1%)	0
	H	201 (52%)	95 (25%)	69 (18%)	17 (4%)	3 (1%)	0
	NH	206 (76%)	50 (18%)	13 (5%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
Child's attitude toward Saturday School: positive vs. negative	Total	429 (66%)	138 (21%)	67 (10%)	18 (3%)	3 (<1%)	3
	H	223 (58%)	93 (24%)	48 (12%)	16 (4%)	3 (1%)	2
	NH	206 (76%)	45 (16%)	19 (7%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	1
Indications of parent follow-up of Saturday School or previous visit		Two or more samples	One	None			Blank
a. Displayed child's work	Total	248 (38%)	266 (41%)	131 (20%)			13
	H	130 (35%)	164 (44%)	82 (22%)			9
	NH	118 (44%)	102 (38%)	49 (18%)			4
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	200 (31%)	319 (49%)	127 (20%)			12
	H	108 (29%)	192 (51%)	77 (20%)			8
	NH	91 (34%)	128 (48%)	50 (19%)			4
c. Initiated teaching of new or related activities	Total	129 (20%)	211 (33%)	305 (47%)			13
	H	58 (15%)	124 (33%)	194 (52%)			9
	NH	70 (26%)	88 (33%)	111 (41%)			4

*Total represents 658 pupils evaluated at least once
H represents 385 pupils rated twice who were identified as having special problems or handicaps
NH represents 273 pupils rated twice who were identified as having no handicap
ED represents 218 parents of pupils rated twice who were identified as having emotional problems

**Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension with the higher number representing the positive end of each continuum.

APPENDIX B-3b

Final Teacher Ratings of PCEE Pupils and Parents on the Items of the Home Teaching Report During Spring, 1974 (N = 658)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings** 5	4	3	2	1	Blank
Conditions affecting visit							
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for work	Total	579 (89%)	41 (6%)	11 (2%)	3 (1%)	14 (2%)	10
	H	329 (87%)	29 (8%)	10 (3%)	2 (<1%)	8 (2%)	7
	NH	250 (93%)	12 (4%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	6 (2%)	3
b. Child ready vs. not ready for work	Total	585 (90%)	45 (7%)	9 (1%)	2 (<1%)	8 (1%)	9
	H	337 (89%)	29 (8%)	8 (2%)	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	7
	NH	248 (92%)	16 (6%)	1 (<1%)	6 (2%)		
c. Place prepared for teachers to work	Total	596 (92%)	28 (4%)	11 (2%)	5 (1%)	9 (1%)	9
	H	339 (90%)	21 (6%)	10 (3%)	2 (<1%)	6 (2%)	7
	NH	257 (95%)	7 (3%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
Parent Participation							
a. Observed 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	571 (88%)	53 (8%)	5 (1%)	6 (1%)	16 (2%)	7
	H	334 (88%)	26 (7%)	3 (1%)	4 (1%)	13 (3%)	5
	NH	237 (88%)	27 (10%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	2
b. Participated 100% vs. 0% of time	Total	406 (62%)	124 (19%)	82 (13%)	23 (4%)	16 (2%)	7
	H	227 (60%)	74 (20%)	48 (13%)	18 (5%)	13 (3%)	5
	NH	179 (66%)	50 (18%)	34 (12%)	5 (2%)	3 (1%)	2
Parent Attitude toward Teaching Session							
a. Positive vs. Negative	Total	499 (77%)	121 (19%)	22 (3%)	6 (1%)	2 (<1%)	8
	H	280 (74%)	78 (20%)	16 (4%)	5 (1%)	1 (<1%)	5
	NH	219 (81%)	43 (16%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	3
b. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	518 (80%)	96 (15%)	26 (4%)	6 (1%)	4 (1%)	8
	H	296 (78%)	56 (15%)	20 (5%)	5 (1%)	3 (1%)	5
	NH	222 (82%)	40 (15%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	3

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3b (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings**					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. Self-confident vs. lacking confidence	Total	467 (72%)	120 (18%)	54 (8%)	6 (1%)	3 (<1%)	8
	H	245 (64%)	82 (22%)	45 (12%)	6 (2%)	2 (<1%)	5
	NH	222 (82%)	38 (14%)	9 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	3
Parent Interaction with Child							
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	Total	455 (70%)	150 (23%)	32 (5%)	11 (2%)	[illegible] (<1%)	8
	H	245 (64%)	97 (26%)	28 (7%)	8 (2%)	[illegible] (<1%)	5
	NH	210 (78%)	53 (20%)	4 (2%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	3
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	Total	365 (56%)	194 (30%)	67 (10%)	20 (3%)	4 (1%)	8
	H	175 (46%)	130 (34%)	54 (14%)	18 (5%)	3 (1%)	5
	NH	190 (70%)	64 (24%)	13 (5%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	3
	ED	98 (45%)	72 (33%)	39 (18%)	7 (3%)	2 (1%)	0
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	Total	420 (65%)	153 (23%)	63 (10%)	10 (2%)	4 (1%)	8
	H	218 (57%)	101 (27%)	49 (13%)	8 (2%)	4 (1%)	5
	NH	202 (75%)	52 (19%)	14 (5%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	3
	ED	125 (57%)	57 (26%)	30 (14%)	2 (1%)	4 (2%)	0
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	Total	421 (65%)	156 (24%)	59 (9%)	10 (2%)	4 (1%)	8
	H	220 (58%)	100 (26%)	48 (13%)	8 (2%)	4 (1%)	5
	NH	201 (74%)	56 (21%)	11 (4%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	3
	ED	125 (57%)	57 (26%)	30 (14%)	2 (1%)	4 (2%)	0
e. Competent vs. incompetent	Total	450 (69%)	154 (24%)	36 (6%)	8 (1%)	2 (<1%)	8
	H	235 (62%)	103 (27%)	34 (9%)	6 (2%)	2 (<1%)	5
	NH	215 (80%)	51 (19%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	3
Parent Relationship with Teacher							
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	Total	564 (87%)	68 (10%)	13 (2%)	4 (1%)	1 (<1%)	8
	H	321 (84%)	46 (12%)	9 (2%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	5
	NH	243 (90%)	22 (8%)	4 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	3

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3b (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings**					
		5	4	3	2	1	Blank
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	538 (83%)	92 (14%)	15 (2%)	4 (1%)	1 (< 1%)	8
	H	309 (81%)	55 (14%)	12 (3%)	3 (1%)	1 (< 1%)	5
	NH	229 (85%)	37 (14%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	3
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	Total	490 (75%)	129 (20%)	25 (4%)	4 (1%)	2 (<1%)	8
	H	266 (70%)	90 (24%)	19 (5%)	3 (1%)	2 (<1%)	5
	NH	224 (83%)	39 (14%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	3
Child's Relationship with Teacher							
a. Outgoing vs. shy	Total	387 (59%)	170 (26%)	67 (10%)	21 (3%)	13 (2%)	0
	H	209 (54%)	99 (26%)	50 (13%)	19 (5%)	8 (2%)	0
	NH	178 (65%)	71 (26%)	17 (6%)	2 (1%)	5 (2%)	0
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	Total	433 (66%)	153 (23%)	58 (9%)	11 (2%)	3 (<1%)	0
	H	223 (58%)	109 (28%)	44 (11%)	7 (2%)	2 (<1%)	0
	NH	210 (77%)	44 (16%)	14 (5%)	4 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	Total	374 (57%)	176 (27%)	72 (11%)	21 (3%)	14 (2%)	1
	H	200 (52%)	102 (27%)	56 (15%)	17 (4%)	9 (2%)	1
	NH	174 (64%)	74 (27%)	16 (6%)	4 (2%)	5 (2%)	0
Child's Response to Learning Activities							
a. Interested vs. disinterested	Total	520 (79%)	115 (18%)	19 (3%)	3 (<1%)	1 (< 1%)	0
	H	286 (74%)	84 (22%)	14 (4%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)	0
	NH	234 (86%)	31 (11%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
b. Attentive vs. distracted	Total	438 (67%)	162 (25%)	40 (6%)	12 (2%)	6 (1%)	0
	H	224 (58%)	113 (29%)	33 (9%)	11 (3%)	4 (1%)	0
	NH	214 (78%)	49 (18%)	7 (3%)	1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	0

(continued)

APPENDIX B-3b (continued)

Rating Scale	Sample*	Ratings** 5	4	3	2	1	Blank
c. Attained all vs. none of objectives	Total	427 (65%)	173 (26%)	49 (7%)	8 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
	H	222 (58%)	118 (31%)	38 (10%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	0
	NH	205 (75%)	55 (20%)	11 (4%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	0
Child's attitude toward Saturday School: positive vs. negative	Total	509 (78%)	105 (16%)	32 (5%)	7 (1%)	2 (<1%)	3
	H	277 (72%)	77 (20%)	22 (6%)	5 (1%)	2 (<1%)	2
	NH	232 (85%)	28 (10%)	10 (4%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	1
Indications of Parent follow-up of Saturday School or previous visit		Two or more samples	One	None			Blank
a. Displayed child's work	Total	241 (37%)	264 (41%)	140 (22%)			13
	H	145 (39%)	144 (38%)	87 (23%)			9
	NH	96 (36%)	120 (45%)	53 (20%)			4
b. Used materials or activities suggested	Total	198 (31%)	320 (50%)	128 (20%)			12
	H	116 (31%)	186 (49%)	75 (20%)			8
	NH	82 (30%)	134 (50%)	53 (20%)			4
c. Initiated teaching of new or related activities	Total	153 (24%)	240 (37%)	252 (39%)			13
	H	85 (23%)	128 (34%)	163 (43%)			9
	NH	68 (25%)	112 (42%)	89 (33%)			4

*Total represents 658 pupils evaluated at least once
H represents 385 pupils rated twice who were identified as having special problems or handicaps
NH represents 273 pupils rated twice who were identified as having no handicap
ED represents 218 parents of pupils rated twice who were identified as having emotional problems

**Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension with the higher number representing the positive end of each continuum

APPENDIX C-1a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N = 783), Pupils Identified as Emotionally Disturbed (N = 289), Pupils Identified as Not Having Handicaps of Any Kind (N = 412), and Pupils Identified as Handicapped (N = 381)
November, 1971

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	35 (4%)	422 (53%)	210 (26%)	99 (15%)	27 (3%)
	ED	4 (1%)	115 (40%)	94 (33%)	54 (19%)	22 (8%)
	NH	28 (7%)	267 (65%)	85 (21%)	29 (7%)	3 (1%)
	H	7 (2%)	155 (41%)	125 (33%)	70 (18%)	24 (6%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failure or other strong stress as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing.	Total	13 (2%)	73 (9%)	224 (28%)	368 (46%)	115 (15%)
	ED	11 (4%)	41 (14%)	108 (37%)	105 (36%)	24 (8%)
	NH	1 (<1%)	21 (5%)	85 (21%)	221 (54%)	84 (20%)
	H	12 (3%)	52 (14%)	139 (36%)	147 (39%)	31 (8%)

(continued)

APPENDIX C-1[a] (continued)

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	13 (2%)	78 (10%)	248 (31%)	398 (50%)	56 (7%)
	ED	10 (3%)	43 (15%)	99 (34%)	118 (41%)	19 (7%)
	NH	2 (<1%)	21 (5%)	118 (29%)	238 (58%)	33 (8%)
	H	11 (3%)	57 (15%)	130 (34%)	160 (42%)	23 (6%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	16 (2%)	74 (9%)	147 (19%)	366 (46%)	190 (24%)
	ED	11 (4%)	40 (14%)	56 (19%)	116 (40%)	66 (23%)
	NH	5 (1%)	23 (6%)	73 (18%)	203 (49%)	108 (26%)
	H	11 (3%)	51 (13%)	74 (19%)	163 (43%)	82 (22%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	31 (4%)	270 (34%)	346 (43%)	112 (14%)	34 (4%)
	ED	5 (2%)	63 (22%)	136 (47%)	62 (21%)	23 (8%)
	NH	25 (6%)	183 (44%)	169 (41%)	29 (7%)	6 (1%)
	H	6 (2%)	87 (23%)	177 (46%)	83 (22%)	28 (7%)

APPENDIX C-1b

Final Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N=757), Pupils Identified as Emotionally Disturbed (N=242), Pupils Identified as Not Having Handicaps of Any Kind (N=412), and Pupils Identified as Handicapped (N=345) May, 1972

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	111 (15%)	418 (55%)	168 (22%)	56 (7%)	4 (1%)
	ED	27 (11%)	118 (49%)	69 (29%)	26 (11%)	2 (1%)
	NH	75 (18%)	245 (59%)	71 (17%)	21 (5%)	0 (0%)
	H	36 (10%)	173 (50%)	97 (28%)	35 (10%)	4 (1%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failure or other strong stress as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing	Total	10 (1%)	75 (10%)	189 (25%)	339 (45%)	144 (19%)
	ED	3 (1%)	39 (16%)	74 (31%)	90 (37%)	36 (15%)
	NH	4 (1%)	25 (6%)	92 (22%)	202 (49%)	89 (22%)
	H	6 (2%)	50 (14%)	97 (28%)	137 (40%)	55 (16%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	3 (<1%)	66 (9%)	202 (27%)	357 (47%)	129 (17%)
	ED	1 (<1%)	35 (14%)	73 (30%)	97 (40%)	36 (15%)
	NH	1 (<1%)	24 (6%)	94 (23%)	208 (50%)	85 (21%)
	H	2 (1%)	42 (12%)	108 (31%)	149 (43%)	44 (13%)

Continued

APPENDIX C-1b (Continued)

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	14 (2%)	43 (6%)	156 (21%)	282 (37%)	262 (35%)
	ED	4 (2%)	24 (10%)	51 (21%)	85 (35%)	78 (32%)
	NH	7 (2%)	15 (4%)	81 (20%)	156 (38%)	153 (37%)
	H	7 (2%)	28 (8%)	75 (22%)	126 (37%)	109 (32%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	112 (15%)	313 (41%)	241 (32%)	81 (11%)	10 (1%)
	ED	24 (10%)	84 (35%)	92 (38%)	34 (14%)	8 (3%)
	NH	80 (19%)	190 (46%)	109 (26%)	31 (8%)	2 (<1%)
	H	32 (9%)	123 (36%)	132 (38%)	50 (14%)	8 (2%)

APPENDIX C-1c

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1972) on "The Self Esteem Scale" and on "The Kindergarten School Adjustment Scale"

Item	F	Group^1	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results^2	Standard Deviation
SELF ESTEEM SCALE				
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels confortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities	1.90 n.s.	PCEE	3.79	.86
		P-S	3.78	.95
		Control	3.68	.93
2. Child becomes upset by failure or other strong stress	<1 n.s.	PCEE	3.86	.94
		P-S	3.88	.86
		Control	3.85	.96
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher	1.24 n.s.	PCEE	3.73	.98
		P-S	3.72	.99
		Control	3.62	1.03
4. Child continually seeks attention	4.60 p<.025	PCEE	4.01	1.01
		P-S	3.76 a,b	1.15
		Control	3.94	1.09
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self esteem	4.78 p<.01	PCEE	3.42	.96
		P-S	3.56 c,d	1.00
		Control	3.29	.97
KINDERGARTEN SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT SCALE				
1. Relationships with peers in kindergarten	2.82 n.s.	PCEE	4.05	.92
		P-S	3.94	1.01
		Control	3.91	.98
2. Relationships with kindergarten school teachers	1.54 n.s.	PCEE	4.10	.96
		P-S	3.98	.97
		Control	4.02	.93

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX C-1c (Cont'd.)

Item	F	Group[1]	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
3. Creative use of individual activities	<1 n.s.	PCEE	3.98	.92
		P-S	3.93	.96
		Control	3.90	.93
4. Signs of behavioral immaturity	<1 n.s.	PCEE	4.17	.96
		P-S	4.15	1.02
		Control	4.15	.98
5. Signs of behavioral eccentricity	<1 n.s.	PCEE	4.13	1.02
		P-S	4.07	1.02
		Control	4.11	1.07

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the first project year program (N=679); pupils with preschool experience (N=200); and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind (N=306).

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given using the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX C-2a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N = 649),
Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 214), and
Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems (N = 426)
Fall 1973

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	48 (7%)	325 (50%)	152 (23%)	92 (14%)	32 (5%)
	ED	10 (5%)	83 (39%)	52 (24%)	49 (23%)	20 (9%)
	Not ED	37 (9%)	239 (56%)	96 (23%)	43 (10%)	11 (3%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing.	Total	19 (3%)	84 (13%)	171 (26%)	295 (45%)	80 (12%)
	ED	12 (6%)	42 (20%)	70 (33%)	75 (35%)	15 (7%)
	Not ED	6 (1%)	41 (10%)	96 (23%)	219 (51%)	64 (15%)

(continued)

APPENDIX C-2a (continued)

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	29 (4%)	81 (12%)	163 (25%)	308 (47%)	68 (10%)
	ED	18 (8%)	36 (17%)	61 (29%)	77 (36%)	22 (10%)
	Not ED	11 (3%)	45 (11%)	97 (23%)	228 (54%)	45 (11%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	30 (5%)	59 (9%)	106 (16%)	299 (46%)	155 (24%)
	ED	21 (10%)	21 (10%)	38 (18%)	84 (39%)	50 (23%)
	Not ED	9 (2%)	37 (9%)	67 (16%)	210 (49%)	103 (24%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	40 (6%)	214 (33%)	255 (39%)	101 (16%)	39 (6%)
	ED	9 (4%)	45 (21%)	87 (41%)	51 (24%)	22 (10%)
	Not ED	30 (7%)	169 (40%)	162 (38%)	49 (12%)	16 (4%)

APPENDIX C-2b

Final Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N = 649) Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 214), and Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems (N = 426)*
May, 1973

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	59 (9%)	344 (53%)	170 (26%)	68 (10%)	8 (1%)
	ED	13 (6%)	99 (46%)	61 (29%)	38 (18%)	3 (1%)
	Not ED	43 (10%)	242 (57%)	107 (25%)	29 (7%)	5 (1%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing.	Total	16 (2%)	88 (14%)	202 (31%)	249 (38%)	94 (14%)
	ED	8 (4%)	38 (18%)	79 (37%)	70 (33%)	19 (9%)
	Not ED	8 (2%)	48 (11%)	121 (28%)	175 (41%)	74 (17%)

(continued)

APPENDIX C-2b (continued)

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	18 (3%)	92 (14%)	137 (21%)	321 (49%)	81 (12%)
	ED	12 (6%)	35 (16%)	56 (26%)	89 (42%)	22 (10%)
	Not ED	6 (1%)	57 (13%)	77 (18%)	229 (54%)	57 (13%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	30 (5%)	54 (8%)	123 (19%)	273 (42%)	169 (26%)
	ED	15 (7%)	19 (9%)	46 (22%)	77 (36%)	57 (27%)
	Not ED	15 (4%)	35 (8%)	75 (18%)	193 (45%)	108 (25%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	79 (12%)	253 (39%)	210 (32%)	89 (14%)	18 (3%)
	ED	20 (9%)	72 (34%)	74 (35%)	40 (19%)	8 (4%)
	Not ED	57 (13%)	178 (42%)	134 (31%)	48 (11%)	9 (2%)

*The _N_'s used in these analyses are complicated by the fact that nine pupils were initially misclassified as either ED or not ED. These nine pupils are incorporated only in the Total Sample and not in either of the subsamples reported.

APPENDIX C-2c

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests With Extensions for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1973) on "The Self-Esteem Scale" and on "The Kindergarten School Adjustment Scale"

Item	F	Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
SELF-ESTEEM SCALE				
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities:	4.46 <.025	PCEE	3.67	.87
		P-S	3.81 d	.88
		Control	3.54	.87
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing:	2.28 n.s.	PCEE	3.72	.98
		P-S	3.77	1.02
		Control	3.63	.92
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well:	2.49 n.s.	PCEE	3.44	.99
		P-S	3.55	1.01
		Control	3.36	.93
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises:	3.09 <.05	PCEE	3.86	1.14
		P-S	3.65 a	1.17
		Control	3.71	1.03
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness:	4.49 <.025	PCEE	3.16	.98
		P-S	3.28 b,d	.97
		Control	2.98	.90
KINDERGARTEN SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT SCALE				
1. Relationships with peers in kindergarten	3.70 <.05	PCEE	3.85	.97
		P-S	3.75 b	.99
		Control	3.63	.90

(Continued)

APPENDIX C-2c (Continued)

Item	F	Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
2. Relationships with kindergarten school teachers	2.85 n.s.	PCEE	3.96	.94
		P-S	3.82	1.04
		Control	3.79	.95
3. Creative use of individual activities	4.54 $<.025$	PCEE	3.76	1.01
		P-S	3.80 b,d	1.02
		Control	3.52	1.06
4. Signs of behavioral immaturity	4.12 $<.025$	PCEE	4.13	1.01
		P-S	4.18 b,d	1.03
		Control	3.92	.99
5. Signs of behavioral eccentricity	1.31 n.s.	PCEE	4.12	1.05
		P-S	4.07	1.17
		Control	3.98	1.02

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the second project year (N = 599); P-S = pupils who had other kinds of preschool experience (N = 177); and Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind (N = 185.)

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given using the following codes:
a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the Control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX C-3a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N = 685), Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 233), and Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems (N = 452) During the Third Project Year

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	72 (11%)	349 (51%)	166 (24%)	82 (12%)	16 (2%)
	ED	15 (6%)	97 (42%)	62 (27%)	44 (19%)	15 (6%)
	Not ED	57 (13%)	252 (56%)	104 (23%)	38 (8%)	1 (<1%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining or withdrawing.	Total	16 (2%)	71 (10%)	183 (27%)	288 (42%)	127 (19%)
	ED	16 (7%)	40 (17%)	66 (28%)	83 (36%)	28 (12%)
	Not ED	0 (0%)	31 (7%)	117 (26%)	205 (45%)	99 (22%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	7 (1%)	65 (10%)	165 (24%)	313 (46%)	135 (20%)
	ED	6 (3%)	34 (15%)	54 (23%)	103 (44%)	36 (16%)
	Not ED	1 (<1%)	31 (7%)	111 (25%)	210 (46%)	99 (22%)

(continued)

APPENDIX C-3a (continued)

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	16 (2%)	65 (10%)	114 (17%)	306 (45%)	184 (27%)
	ED	10 (4%)	41 (18%)	40 (17%)	97 (42%)	45 (19%)
	Not ED	6 (1%)	24 (5%)	74 (16%)	209 (46%)	139 (31%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	70 (10%)	220 (32%)	262 (38%)	107 (16%)	26 (4%)
	ED	14 (6%)	53 (23%)	88 (38%)	55 (24%)	23 (10%)
	Not ED	56 (12%)	167 (37%)	174 (38%)	52 (12%)	3 (1%)

APPENDIX C-3b

Final Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Self Esteem for the Total Sample (N = 685), Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 233), and Pupils Identified as not Having Emotional Problems (N = 452) During the Third Project Year

Item		5 Always	4 Usually	3 Sometimes	2 Seldom	1 Never
1. Child adapts easily to new situations, feels comfortable in new settings, enters easily into new activities.	Total	60 (9%)	363 (53%)	190 (28%)	62 (9%)	10 (2%)
	ED	10 (4%)	103 (44%)	76 (33%)	36 (16%)	8 (3%)
	Not ED	50 (11%)	260 (58%)	114 (25%)	26 (6%)	2 (<1%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
2. Child becomes upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining or withdrawing	Total	9 (1%)	68 (10%)	210 (31%)	319 (47%)	79 (12%)
	ED	7 (3%)	37 (16%)	88 (38%)	85 (36%)	16 (7%)
	Not ED	2 (<1%)	31 (7%)	122 (27%)	234 (52%)	63 (14%)
		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
3. Child seeks much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as is evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well.	Total	7 (1%)	79 (12%)	181 (26%)	356 (52%)	62 (9%)
	ED	2 (1%)	37 (16%)	73 (31%)	103 (44%)	18 (8%)
	Not ED	5 (1%)	42 (9%)	108 (24%)	253 (56%)	44 (10%)

(continued)

APPENDIX C-3b (continued

Item		1 Always	2 Usually	3 Sometimes	4 Seldom	5 Never
4. Child continually seeks attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises.	Total	12 (2%)	51 (7%)	167 (24%)	311 (45%)	144 (21%)
	ED	7 (3%)	25 (11%)	75 (32%)	85 (36%)	41 (18%)
	Not ED	5 (1%)	26 (6%)	92 (20%)	226 (50%)	103 (23%)
		5 Very Strong	4 Strong	3 Medium	2 Mild	1 Weak
5. Extent to which child shows a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness.	Total	77 (11%)	248 (36%)	270 (39%)	71 (10%)	19 (3%)
	ED	15 (6%)	70 (30%)	100 (43%)	36 (16%)	12 (5%)
	Not ED	62 (14%)	178 (39%)	170 (38%)	35 (8%)	7 (2%)

APPENDIX D-1

Parent Ratings of PCEE Pupils' Behavior ($\underline{N}$ = 625) at the Time of Entry into the PCEE Program (1971) and at the Time of Entry into Kindergarten (1972)

			2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
1.	Child snaps, buttons, and zips clothing	1971	312 (50%)	287 (46%)	25 (4%)	1
		1972	485 (82%)	104 (18%)	3 (1%)	33
2.	Child goes to the toilet by himself	1971	578 (93%)	43 (7%)	3 (<1%)	1
		1972	577 (97%)	16 (3%)	1 (<1%)	31
3.	Child takes good care of things he uses	1971	284 (46%)	318 (51%)	22 (4%)	1
		1972	365 (62%)	224 (38%)	2 (<1%)	34
4.	Child pays attention and concentrates well	1971	220 (35%)	387 (62%)	17 (3%)	1
		1972	254 (43%)	329 (56%)	6 (1%)	36
5.	Child follows simple directions without reminding	1971	255 (41%)	358 (57%)	11 (2%)	1
		1972	302 (51%)	287 (48%)	4 (1%)	32
6.	Child tells what he wants or needs	1971	583 (93%)	40 (7%)	1 (<1%)	1
		1972	544 (92%)	50 (8%)	0 (0%)	31
7.	Child takes turns and shares	1971	292 (47%)	327 (52%)	5 (1%)	1
		1972	362 (61%)	230 (39%)	2 (<1%)	31
8.	Child remembers rules of games he plays	1971	207 (33%)	353 (57%)	64 (10%)	1
		1972	335 (57%)	241 (41%)	12 (2%)	37
9.	Child prefers to play alone	1971	16 (3%)	487 (78%)	121 (19%)	1
		1972	14 (2%)	432 (75%)	128 (22%)	51
10.	Child plays with a few other children	1971	351 (56%)	264 (42%)	8 (1%)	2
		1972	338 (59%)	235 (41%)	3 (1%)	49
11.	Child plays with many children	1971	184 (29%)	354 (57%)	86 (14%)	1
		1972	221 (38%)	324 (56%)	37 (6%)	43
12.	Child helps with simple household jobs	1971	331 (53%)	278 (45%)	15 (2%)	1
		1972	339 (57%)	249 (42%)	5 (1%)	32
13.	Child speaks in sentences of five or more words	1971	572 (92%)	47 (8%)	5 (1%)	1
		1972	573 (96%)	20 (3%)	1 (<1%)	31
14.	Child identifies six or more colors	1971	433 (69%)	104 (17%)	87 (14%)	1
		1972	559 (95%)	23 (4%)	7 (1%)	36
15.	Child recites rhymes, sings songs	1971	351 (56%)	219 (35%)	54 (9%)	1
		1972	427 (72%)	151 (26%)	12 (2%)	35

(cont'd.)

APPENDIX D-1 (cont'd.)

		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
16. Child tells how things are alike or different	1971	314 (50%)	266 (43%)	44 (7%)	1
	1972	438 (74%)	148 (25%)	4 (1%)	35
17. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	1971	313 (50%)	173 (28%)	138 (22%)	1
	1972	471 (82%)	83 (14%)	19 (3%)	52
18. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet.	1971	208 (33%)	100 (16%)	316 (51%)	1
	1972	380 (65%)	84 (14%)	117 (20%)	44
19. Child prints his first name correctly	1971	139 (22%)	105 (17%)	380 (61%)	1
	1972	421 (71%)	122 (21%)	47 (8%)	35
20. Child tells his whole name	1971	472 (76%)	105 (17%)	47 (8%)	1
	1972	567 (97%)	16 (3%)	4 (1%)	38
21. Child tells his address	1971	136 (22%)	193 (31%)	295 (47%)	1
	1972	345 (60%)	156 (27%)	76 (13%)	48
22. Child tells his telephone number	1971	60 (10%)	74 (12%)	490 (79%)	1
	1972	259 (45%)	115 (20%)	202 (35%)	49
23. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	1971	466 (75%)	99 (16%)	59 (9%)	1
	1972	559 (95%)	25 (4%)	7 (1%)	34
24. Child can ride a tricycle or bicycle	1971	611 (98%)	10 (2%)	5 (1%)	1
	1972	579 (98%)	7 (1%)	5 (1%)	34
25. Child runs, hops, and jumps	1971	601 (96%)	23 (4%)	0 (0%)	1
	1972	578 (98%)	13 (22%)	1 (<1%)	33
26. Child claps or marches in time to music	1971	398 (64%)	196 (31%)	30 (5%)	1
	1972	450 (76%)	129 (22%)	11 (2%)	35
27. Child uses scissors with control	1971	214 (34%)	289 (46%)	121 (19%)	1
	1972	391 (66%)	183 (31%)	15 (3%)	36

		2 Often	1 Once in a While	0 Not at All	Blank
28. Child has trouble with eating	1971	75 (12%)	278 (45%)	270 (43%)	2
	1972	52 (9%)	223 (39%)	304 (53%)	46
29. Child has trouble with sleeping	1971	23 (4%)	145 (23%)	454 (73%)	3
	1972	11 (2%)	93 (16%)	468 (82%)	53

(cont'd.)

APPENDIX D-1 (cont'd.)

		2 Often	1 Once in a While	0 Not at All	Blan
30. Child has trouble with stomach irregularities	1971	7 (1%)	111 (18%)	504 (81%)	3
	1972	3 (1%)	103 (18%)	474 (82%)	45
31. Child has trouble getting along with children	1971	106 (17%)	297 (48%)	219 (35%)	3
	1972	56 (10%)	228 (40%)	293 (51%)	48
32. Child has trouble getting along with adults	1971	114 (18%)	173 (28%)	335 (54%)	3
	1972	60 (10%)	120 (21%)	395 (69%)	50
33. Child has trouble with unusual fears	1971	17 (3%)	219 (35%)	386 (62%)	3
	1972	10 (2%)	130 (22%)	440 (76%)	45
34. Child has trouble with nervousness	1971	12 (2%)	176 (28%)	434 (70%)	3
	1972	7 (1%)	137 (24%)	435 (75%)	46
35. Child has trouble with thumbsucking	1971	86 (14%)	59 (9%)	478 (77%)	2
	1972	51 (9%)	54 (9%)	475 (82%)	45
36. Child has trouble with overactivity	1971	55 (9%)	198 (32%)	369 (59%)	3
	1972	22 (4%)	136 (24%)	420 (73%)	47
37. Child has trouble with daydreaming	1971	9 (1%)	185 (30%)	429 (69%)	2
	1972	3 (1%)	146 (25%)	429 (74%)	47
38. Child has trouble with temper tantrums	1971	28 (4%)	328 (53%)	267 (43%)	2
	1972	13 (2%)	230 (40%)	338 (58%)	44
39. Child has trouble with crying	1971	38 (6%)	403 (65%)	182 (29%)	2
	1972	29 (5%)	312 (54%)	242 (42%)	42
40. Child has trouble with lying	1971	11 (2%)	280 (45%)	332 (53%)	2
	1972	7 (1%)	235 (41%)	337 (58%)	46
41. Child has trouble with tearing or breaking things	1971	6 (1%)	251 (40%)	365 (59%)	3
	1972	1 (<1%)	122 (21%)	456 (79%)	46
42. Child has trouble with wetting	1971	43 (7%)	129 (21%)	451 (72%)	2
	1972	25 (4%)	72 (12%)	483 (83%)	45
43. Child has trouble with speech	1971	50 (8%)	165 (27%)	407 (65%)	3
	1972	29 (5%)	73 (13%)	474 (82%)	49

(cont'd.)

APPENDIX D-1 (cont'd.)

			2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
44.	Child is read to	1971	360 (58%)	252 (40%)	11 (2%)	2
		1972	333 (57%)	248 (42%)	6 (1%)	38
45.	Child goes to library	1971	240 (39%)	183 (29%)	199 (32%)	3
		1972	160 (27%)	272 (46%)	158 (27%)	35
46.	Child watches Sesame Street	1971	335 (54%)	241 (39%)	46 (7%)	3
		1972	339 (58%)	222 (38%)	28 (5%)	36
47.	Child takes trips outside the community	1971	385 (62%)	220 (35%)	17 (3%)	3
		1972	335 (57%)	239 (41%)	15 (3%)	36

APPENDIX D-2

Parent Ratings of PCEE Pupils' Behavior ($\underline{N}$ = 525) at the Time of Entry into the PCEE Program (1972) and at the Time of Entry into Kindergarten (1973)

		2	1	0	
Item		Regularly	Sometimes	Not Yet	Blank
1. Child snaps, buttons, and zips clothing	1972	269 (52%)	231 (46%)	18 (3%)	7
	1973	370 (83%)	71 (16%)	7 (2%)	77
2. Child goes to the toilet by himself	1972	487 (94%)	30 (6%)	1 (<1%)	7
	1973	435 (97%)	13 (3%)	0 (0%)	77
3. Child takes good care of things he uses	1972	223 (43%)	272 (53%)	23 (4%)	7
	1973	279 (62%)	168 (38%)	1 (<1%)	77
4. Child pays attention and concentrates well	1972	192 (37%)	319 (62%)	7 (1%)	7
	1973	221 (49%)	223 (50%)	4 (1%)	77
5. Child follows simple directions without reminding	1972	202 (39%)	308 (60%)	7 (1%)	8
	1973	241 (54%)	205 (46%)	2 (<1%)	77
6. Child tells what he wants or needs	1972	476 (92%)	39 (8%)	3 (1%)	7
	1973	411 (92%)	37 (8%)	0 (0%)	77
7. Child takes turns and shares	1972	231 (45%)	284 (55%)	3 (1%)	7
	1973	276 (62%)	171 (38%)	1 (<1%)	77
8. Child remembers rules of games he plays	1972	178 (34%)	288 (56%)	52 (10%)	7
	1973	282 (54%)	161 (30%)	3 (1%)	79
9. Child prefers to play alone	1972	17 (3%)	393 (76%)	107 (21%)	8
	1973	20 (4%)	332 (74%)	96 (21%)	77
0. Child plays with a few other children	1972	300 (58%)	209 (40%)	9 (2%)	7
	1973	262 (58%)	182 (41%)	4 (1%)	77
1. Child plays with many children	1972	167 (32%)	285 (55%)	66 (13%)	7
	1973	183 (41%)	244 (54%)	21 (5%)	77
2. Child helps with simple household jobs	1972	249 (48%)	264 (51%)	4 (1%)	8
	1973	255 (57%)	188 (42%)	5 (1%)	77

APPENDIX D-2 (Continued)

		2	1	0	
Item		Regularly	Sometimes	Not Yet	Blank
13. Child speaks in sentences of five or more words	1972	491 (95%)	25 (5%)	2 (<1%)	7
	1973	438 (98%)	10 (2%)	0 (0%)	77
14. Child identifies six or more colors	1972	355 (68%)	94 (18%)	70 (13%)	6
	1973	347 (77%)	94 (21%)	7 (2%)	77
15. Child recites rhymes, sings songs	1972	271 (52%)	211 (41%)	37 (7%)	6
	1973	424 (95%)	18 (4%)	6 (1%)	77
16. Child tells how things are alike or different	1972	274 (53%)	217 (42%)	28 (5%)	6
	1973	345 (77%)	100 (22%)	2 (<1%)	78
17. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	1972	288 (55%)	146 (28%)	85 (16%)	6
	1973	383 (86%)	56 (13%)	8 (2%)	78
18. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	1972	174 (34%)	111 (21%)	234 (45%)	6
	1973	313 (70%)	63 (14%)	70 (16%)	79
19. Child prints his first name correctly	1972	134 (26%)	85 (16%)	300 (58%)	6
	1973	347 (78%)	83 (19%)	17 (4%)	78
20. Child tells his whole name	1972	408 (79%)	73 (14%)	38 (7%)	6
	1973	422 (94%)	25 (6%)	0 (0%)	78
21. Child tells his address	1972	124 (24%)	147 (28%)	248 (48%)	6
	1973	247 (55%)	130 (29%)	70 (16%)	78
22. Child tells his telephone number	1972	60 (12%)	63 (12%)	396 (76%)	6
	1973	199 (45%)	80 (18%)	167 (37%)	79
23. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	1972	390 (75%)	86 (17%)	43 (8%)	6
	1973	439 (98%)	6 (1%)	2 (<1%)	78
24. Child can ride a bicycle or tricycle	1972	500 (96%)	17 (3%)	2 (<1%)	6
	1973	441 (99%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	78
25. Child runs, hops, and jumps	1972	489 (94%)	29 (6%)	1 (<1%)	6
	1973	441 (99%)	6 (1%)	0 (0%)	78
26. Child claps or marches in time to music	1972	345 (66%)	154 (30%)	20 (4%)	6
	1973	345 (77%)	96 (21%)	6 (1%)	78

APPENDIX D-2 (Continued)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blan
27. Child uses scissors with control	1972	185 (36%)	221 (43%)	113 (22%)	6
	1973	305 (68%)	127 (28%)	15 (3%)	78
28. Child is read to	1972	312 (60%)	200 (39%)	4 (1%)	9
	1973	262 (59%)	177 (40%)	7 (2%)	79
29. Child goes to the library	1972	188 (36%)	171 (33%)	159 (31%)	7
	1973	114 (26%)	204 (46%)	127 (29%)	80
30. Child watches Sesame Street	1972	292 (56%)	185 (36%)	41 (8%)	7
	1973	288 (65%)	144 (32%)	13 (3%)	80
31. Child takes trips outside the community	1972	307 (59%)	184 (36%)	26 (5%)	8
	1973	237 (53%)	195 (44%)	13 (3%)	80
		2 Often	1 Once in a While	0 Not At All	Blar
32. Child has trouble with eating	1972	60 (12%)	247 (48%)	212 (41%)	6
	1973	34 (8%)	145 (33%)	258 (59%)	88
33. Child has trouble with sleeping	1972	14 (3%)	118 (23%)	387 (75%)	6
	1973	7 (2%)	70 (16%)	357 (82%)	91
34. Child has trouble with stomach irregularities	1972	6 (1%)	92 (18%)	421 (81%)	6
	1973	4 (1%)	74 (17%)	357 (82%)	90
35. Child has trouble getting along with children	1972	46 (9%)	257 (50%)	216 (42%)	6
	1973	43 (10%)	180 (41%)	215 (49%)	87
36. Child has trouble getting along with adults	1972	51 (10%)	165 (32%)	303 (58%)	6
	1973	46 (11%)	91 (21%)	298 (69%)	90
37. Child has trouble with unusual fears	1972	17 (3%)	176 (34%)	326 (63%)	6
	1973	8 (2%)	87 (20%)	338 (78%)	92
38. Child has trouble with nervousness	1972	18 (3%)	137 (26%)	364 (70%)	6
	1973	13 (3%)	100 (23%)	322 (74%)	90
39. Child has trouble with thumbsucking	1972	70 (13%)	34 (7%)	415 (80%)	6
	1973	29 (7%)	48 (11%)	358 (82%)	90

APPENDIX D-2 (Continued)

Item		2 Often	1 Once in a While	0 Not At All	Blan
40. Child has trouble with overactivity	1972	35 (7%)	148 (29%)	236 (45%)	6
	1973	25 (6%)	87 (20%)	322 (74%)	91
41. Child has trouble with day dreaming	1972	5 (1%)	144 (28%)	370 (71%)	6
	1973	4 (1%)	92 (21%)	336 (78%)	93
42. Child has trouble with temper tantrums	1972	24 (5%)	268 (52%)	227 (44%)	6
	1973	8 (2%)	160 (37%)	269 (62%)	88
43. Child has trouble with crying	1972	32 (6%)	303 (58%)	184 (35%)	6
	1973	14 (3%)	229 (53%)	193 (44%)	89
44. Child has trouble with lying	1972	4 (1%)	224 (43%)	291 (56%)	6
	1973	6 (1%)	155 (36%)	273 (63%)	91
45. Child has trouble with tearing or breaking things	1972	10 (2%)	180 (35%)	329 (63%)	6
	1973	3 (1%)	86 (20%)	347 (80%)	89
46. Child has trouble with wetting	1972	33 (6%)	121 (23%)	364 (70%)	7
	1973	11 (3%)	77 (18%)	348 (80%)	89
47. Child has trouble with speech	1972	51 (10%)	112 (22%)	356 (69%)	6
	1973	16 (4%)	62 (14%)	355 (82%)	92

APPENDIX E-1

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1972) on "Introducing My Kindergarten Child"

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
Child dresses self: gloves	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.76	.47
		P-S	1.78	.47
		Control	1.73	.50
Child dresses self: coat, jacket, or sweater	5.63 $p<.005$	PCEE	1.90	.32
		P-S	1.92 b,d	.29
		Control	1.82	.42
Child dresses self: boots	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.59	.61
		P-S	1.59	.61
		Control	1.59	.62
Child buttons, snaps, and zips clothing	2.86 n.s.	PCEE	1.81	.40
		P-S	1.81	.41
		Control	1.74	.47
Child ties shoelaces or bows	1.61 n.s.	PCEE	1.17	.90
		P-S	1.28	.87
		Control	1.14	.90
Child goes to toilet by himself	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.97	.18
		P-S	1.98	.12
		Control	1.98	.17
Child takes good care of things he uses	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.61	.49
		P-S	1.57	.52
		Control	1.59	.52
Child pays attention and concentrates well	1.98 n.s.	PCEE	1.42	.52
		P-S	1.51	.53
		Control	1.42	.52
Child follows simple directions without reminding	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.51	.51
		P-S	1.49	.54
		Control	1.48	.53
Child tells what he wants or needs	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.91	.29
		P-S	1.90	.30
		Control	1.89	.33
Child takes turns and shares	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.60	.50
		P-S	1.59	.50
		Control	1.61	.50

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1 (Cont'd.)

Variable	F	Group^1	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results^2	Standard Deviation
Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.63	.51
		P-S	1.58	.51
		Control	1.64	.50
Child shows leadership in organizing games	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.16	.60
		P-S	1.23	.66
		Control	1.17	.62
Child remembers rules of games he plays	3.95 p<.025	PCEE	1.55	.54
		P-S	1.58 b,d	.58
		Control	1.45	.60
Child finishes a game even if he is losing	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.39	.58
		P-S	1.40	.61
		Control	1.39	.60
Child prefers to play alone	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.81	.46
		P-S	.84	.46
		Control	.85	.46
Child plays with a few children	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.58	.50
		P-S	1.60	.51
		Control	1.56	.53
Child plays with many children	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.31	.59
		P-S	1.35	.58
		Control	1.31	.63
Child helps with simple household jobs	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.55	.52
		P-S	1.51	.56
		Control	1.53	.52
Child finishes a task	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.45	.53
		P-S	1.47	.53
		Control	1.44	.53
Child speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	3.31 p<.05	PCEE	1.96	.20
		P-S	2.00 c,d	.00
		Control	1.97	.22
Child recites rhymes, sings songs	10.55 p<.005	PCEE	1.70	.50
		P-S	1.81 b,c,d	.46
		Control	1.59	.56
Child identifies 6 or more colors	21.04 p<.005	PCEE	1.93	.29
		P-S	1.98 b,d	.14
		Control	1.80	.50

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1(Cont'd.)

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
Child tells events of a story or experience	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.82	.41
		P-S	1.81	.42
		Control	1.78	.46
Child tells his whole name	6.87 p<.005	PCEE	1.95	.24
		P-S	1.89 a,b	.38
		Control	1.88	.40
Child tells his address	3.00 n.s.	PCEE	1.46	.72
		P-S	1.39	.76
		Control	1.33	.77
Child tells his telephone number	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.10	.89
		P-S	1.05	.92
		Control	.96	.91
Child tells how things are alike or different	3.96 p<.025	PCEE	1.73	.46
		P-S	1.78 d	.43
		Control	1.65	.55
Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	8.48 p<.005	PCEE	1.79	.48
		P-S	1.81 b,d	.42
		Control	1.64	.62
Child identifies many letters	11.76 p<.005	PCEE	1.44	.81
		P-S	1.54 b,d	.73
		Control	1.19	.90
Child reads simple sentences	8.43 p<.005	PCEE	.23	.56
		P-S	.27 b,d	.60
		Control	.09	.31
Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	1.71 n.s.	PCEE	1.93	.30
		P-S	1.90	.39
		Control	1.89	.38
Child recognizes numerals 0 to 10	25.22 p<.005	PCEE	1.75	.53
		P-S	1.73 b,d	.57
		Control	1.44	.74
Child groups objects into sets of 0 to 10	17.59 p<.005	PCEE	1.62	.59
		P-S	1.56 b,d	.65
		Control	1.34	.78

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1 (Cont'd.)

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\overline{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
Child runs, hops, and jumps	1.63 n.s.	PCEE	1.98	.16
		P-S	1.99	.10
		Control	1.96	.21
Child can ride a tricycle or bicycle	1.21 n.s.	PCEE	1.97	.21
		P-S	1.99	.07
		Control	1.98	.17
Child aims and catches a ball	1.47 n.s.	PCEE	1.65	.51
		P-S	1.58	.53
		Control	1.62	.52
Child claps or marches in time with music	1.16 n.s.	PCEE	1.75	.47
		P-S	1.74	.46
		Control	1.70	.55
Child skips	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.57	.70
		P-S	1.58	.71
		Control	1.57	.70
Child works a puzzle of 12 or more pieces	10.95 $p < .005$	PCEE	1.70	.51
		P-S	1.66 b,d	.59
		Control	1.51	.66
Child uses crayons and paint with control	2.77 n.s.	PCEE	1.73	.48
		P-S	1.78	.46
		Control	1.68	.52
Child uses scissors with control	3.49 $p < .05$	PCEE	1.64	.53
		P-S	1.63 b,d	.58
		Control	1.53	.65
Child includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	12.29 $p < .005$	PCEE	1.61	.59
		P-S	1.59 b,d	.65
		Control	1.38	.73
Child prints his first name correctly	24.22 $p < .005$	PCEE	1.63	.64
		P-S	1.44 a,b,d	.75
		Control	1.28	.80
Child prints his whole name correctly	6.33 $p < .005$	PCEE	.79	.84
		P-S	.77 b,d	.82
		Control	.58	.76

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1(Cont'd)

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\overline{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
Child has had trouble with eating (too much or too little)	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.56	.65
		P-S	.51	.65
		Control	.59	.68
Child has had trouble with sleeping (too much or too little)	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.20	.45
		P-S	.21	.44
		Control	.24	.47
Child has had trouble with stomach irregularities	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.18	.41
		P-S	.21	.40
		Control	.22	.43
Child has had trouble getting along with children	2.22 n.s.	PCEE	.61	.68
		P-S	.56	.66
		Control	.69	.72
Child has had trouble getting along with adults	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.43	.70
		P-S	.42	.67
		Control	.50	.76
Child has had trouble with unusual fears	1.34 n.s.	PCEE	.27	.53
		P-S	.34	.52
		Control	.28	.49
Child has had trouble with nervousness	4.02 $p<.025$	PCEE	.26	.47
		P-S	.33 e	.56
		Control	.36	.56
Child has had trouble with thumbsucking	4.36 $p<.025$	PCEE	.27	.61
		P-S	.29 b,d	.66
		Control	.15	.46
Child has had trouble with overactivity	4.10 $p<.025$	PCEE	.31	.54
		P-S	.42 c,e	.60
		Control	.40	.63
Child has had trouble with daydreaming	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.26	.45
		P-S	.28	.49
		Control	.29	.49
Child has had trouble with temper tantrums	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.45	.54
		P-S	.41	.55
		Control	.46	.57

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1 (Cont'd.)

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\overline{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
Child has had trouble with crying	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.64	.57
		P-S	.62	.59
		Control	.67	.53
Child has had trouble with lying	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.42	.52
		P-S	.44	.52
		Control	.40	.49
Child has had trouble with tearing or breaking things	1.5[illegible] n.s.	PCEE	.22	.42
		P-S	.24	.46
		Control	.28	.45
Child has had trouble with wetting	1.50 n.s.	PCEE	.21	.51
		P-S	.20	.46
		Control	.15	.41
Child has had trouble with speech	<1 n.s.	PCEE	.24	.54
		P-S	.23	.53
		Control	.29	.60
Child is read to	5.98 $p<.005$	PCEE	1.56	.52
		P-S	1.55 b,d	.51
		Control	1.43	.53
Child enjoys music	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.78	.43
		P-S	1.76	.44
		Control	1.77	.45
Child goes to the library	14.89 $p<.005$	PCEE	.99	.74
		P-S	.96 b,d	.73
		Control	.70	.74
Child watches "Sesame Street"	1.56 n.s.	PCEE	1.52	.59
		P-S	1.51	.63
		Control	1.44	.67
Child goes shopping, visits interesting people and places in community	7.32 $p<.005$	PCEE	1.59	.52
		P-S	1.61 b,d	.54
		Control	1.45	.60
Child takes trips outside community	4.40 $p<.025$	PCEE	1.54	.55
		P-S	1.58 b,d	.58
		Control	1.44	.59

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX E-1 (Cont'd.)

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the first project year program (N=649); pupils with Pre-School Experience (N=201); and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind (N=267).

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given in the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX E-2

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1973) on the Items of "Introducing My Kindergarten Child"

Item	F	Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child dresses self: gloves	3.18 n.s.	PCEE	1.75	.47
		P-S	1.78	.47
		Control	1.65	.58
Child dresses self: coat, jacket, or sweater	3.04 n.s.	PCEE	1.86	.38
		P-S	1.92	.29
		Control	1.82	.38
Child dresses self: boots	<1 n.s.	PCEE	1.54	.64
		P-S	1.58	.64
		Control	1.53	.62
Child buttons, snaps and zips clothing	1.09 n.s.	PCEE	1.81	.42
		P-S	1.82	.42
		Control	1.76	.47
Child ties shoelaces or bows	3.17 n.s.	PCEE	1.11	.91
		P-S	1.27	.88
		Control	1.01	.95
Child goes to toilet by himself	2.42 n.s.	PCEE	1.97	.17
		P-S	1.99	.08
		Control	1.99	.08
Child takes good care of things he uses	2.83 n.s.	PCEE	1.63	.49
		P-S	1.65	.51
		Control	1.53	.53
Child pays attention and concentrates well	1.45 n.s.	PCEE	1.47	.52
		P-S	1.51	.51
		Control	1.41	.49
Child follows simple directions without reminding	1.38 n.s.	PCEE	1.52	.51
		P-S	1.57	.51
		Control	1.47	.51
Child tells what he wants or needs	2.71 n.s.	PCEE	1.93	.26
		P -S	1.94	.23
		Control	1.88	.35

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child takes turns and shares			PCEE	1.62	.49
	< 1	n. s.	P-S	1.67	.47
			Control	1.64	.50
Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways			PCEE	1.67	.48
	< 1	n. s.	P-S	1.65	.48
			Control	1.62	.50
Child shows leadership in organizing games			PCEE	1.22	.62
	< 1	n. s.	P-S	1.28	.63
			Control	1.24	.64
Child remembers rules of games he plays			PCEE	1.62	.50
	8.80	<.015	P-S	1.67 b,d	.50
			Control	1.44	.61
Child finishes a game even if he is losing			PCEE	1.64	.55
	3.40	n. s.	P-S	1.40	.57
			Control	1.33	.62
Child prefers to play alone			PCEE	.83	.47
	2.20	n. s.	P-S	.86	.39
			Control	.75	.49
Child plays with a few children			PCEE	1.57	.51
	2.74	n. s.	P-S	1.61	.50
			Control	1.48	.59
Child plays with many children			PCEE	1.36	.58
	1.13	n. s.	P-S	1.32	.60
			Control	1.27	.70
Child helps with simple household jobs			PCEE	1.57	.52
	<1	n. s.	P-S	1.54	.52
			Control	1.52	.58
Child finishes a task			PCEE	1.46	.52
	1.79	n. s.	P-S	1.44	.51
			Control	1.37	.55

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child speaks in sentences of five or more words	<1	n. s.	PCEE	1.98	.14
			P-S	1.98	.14
			Control	1.98	.14
Child recites rhymes, sings songs	4.66	$p<.01$	PCEE	1.76	.46
			P-S	1.82 b, d	.40
			Control	1.66	.53
Child identifies six or more colors	13.20	$p<.005$	PCEE	1.94	.29
			P-S	1.92 b, d	.33
			Control	1.77	.55
Child tells events of a story or experience	1.46	n. s.	PCEE	1.81	.42
			P-S	1.86	.41
			Control	1.78	.47
Child tells his whole name	5.42	$<.01$	PCEE	1.95	.22
			P-S	1.93 b, d	.28
			Control	1.86	.43
Child tells his address	5.04	$<.01$	PCEE	1.37	.76
			P-S	1.35 b, d	.76
			Control	1.14	.88
Child tells his telephone number	7.96	$<.005$	PCEE	1.09	.90
			P-S	1.12 b, d	.90
			Control	.77	.86
Child tells how things are alike or different	7.61	$<.005$	PCEE	1.77	.43
			P-S	1.82 b, d	.45
			Control	1.62	.59
Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	18.64	$<.005$	PCEE	1.84	.41
			P-S	1.88 b, d	.38
			Control	1.60	.66
Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	18.16	$<.005$	PCEE	1.54	.75
			P-S	1.62 b, d	.70
			Control	1.14	.90
Child reads simple sentences	4.97	$<.01$	PCEE	.26	.61
			P-S	.26 b, d	.58
			Control	.10	.36

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	6.84	<.005	PCEE	1.98	.17
			P-S	1.97 b, d	.21
			Control	1.89	.42
Child recognizes numerals 0 to 10	28.23	<.005	PCEE	1.81	.44
			P-S	1.83 b, d	.43
			Control	1.47	.76
Child groups objects into sets of 0 to 10	36.32	<.005	PCEE	1.69	.55
			P-S	1.62 b, d	.64
			Control	1.20	.84
Child runs, hops, and jumps	<1	n. s.	PCEE	1.98	.13
			P-S	1.97	.21
			Control	1.97	.16
Child can ride a bicycle or tricycle	<1	n. s.	PCEE	1.98	.19
			P-S	1.98	.18
			Control	1.99	.11
Child aims and catches a ball	1.96	n. s.	PCEE	1.67	.48
			P-S	1.70	.46
			Control	1.59	.56
Child claps or marches in time to music	4.56	<.025	PCEE	1.76	.46
			P-S	1.83 b, d	.39
			Control	1.67	.55
Child skips	2.34	n. s.	PCEE	1.60	.67
			P-S	1.69	.59
			Control	1.53	.72
Child works a puzzle of 12 or more pieces	10.09	<.005	PCEE	1.70	.55
			P-S	1.72 b, d	.53
			Control	1.47	.68
Child uses crayons and paint with control	6.81	<.005	PCEE	1.78	.44
			P-S	1.81 b, d	.44
			Control	1.63	.57
Child uses scissors with control	12.52	<.005	PCEE	1.65	.53
			P-S	1.74 b, d	.50
			Control	1.43	.72

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	11.76	<.005	PCEE	1.64	.58
			P-S	1.63 b, d	.58
			Control	1.36	.77
Child prints his first name correctly	35.85	<.005	PCEE	1.73	.52
			P-S	1.64 b, d	.63
			Control	1.25	.84
Child prints his whole name correctly	10.70	<.005	PCEE	.89	.83
			P-S	.88 b, d	.86
			Control	.54	.79
Child has had trouble with eating (too much or too little)	2.32	n. s.	PCEE	.47	.63
			P - S	.59	.67
			Control	.55	.63
Child has had trouble with sleeping (too much or too little)	4.63	<.025	PCEE	.19	.43
			P-S	.31 c, d	.54
			Control	.17	.41
Child has had trouble with stomach irregularities	1.47	n. s.	PCEE	.18	.40
			P-S	.15	.36
			Control	.23	.45
Child has had trouble getting along with children	< 1	n. s.	PCEE	.61	.67
			P-S	.63	.68
			Control	.69	.72
Child has had trouble getting along with adults	< 1	n. s.	PCEE	.43	.68
			P-S	.47	.71
			Control	.47	.76
Child has had trouble with unusual fears	< 1	n. s.	PCEE	.23	.46
			P-S	.24	.46
			Control	.29	.51
Child has had trouble with nervousness	1.86	n. s.	PCEE	.27	.50
			P-S	.27	.50
			Control	.36	.54
Child has had trouble with thumbsucking	< 1	n. s.	PCEE	.24	.56
			P-S	.30	.64
			Control	.27	.61

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child has had trouble with overactivity	4.23	<.025	PCEE	.32	.58
			P-S	.47 c	.66
			Control	.41	.65
Child has had trouble with daydreaming	1.73	n. s.	PCEE	.22	.44
			P-S	.27	.46
			Control	.30	.50
Child has had trouble with temper tantrums	3.95	<.029	PCEE	.39	.52
			P-S	.49 c, e	.58
			Control	.51	.55
Child has had trouble with crying	2.00	n. s.	PCEE	.58	.55
			P-S	.63	.58
			Control	.68	.56
Child has had trouble with lying	2.61	n. s.	PCEE	.38	.51
			P-S	.42	.53
			Control	.49	.54
Child has had trouble with tearing and breaking things	3.88	<.025	PCEE	.20	.42
			P-S	.20 e, f	.43
			Control	.31	.46
Child has had trouble with wetting	<1	n. s.	PCEE	.20	.45
			P-S	.20	.51
			Control	.18	.46
Child has had trouble with speech	<1	n. s.	PCEE	.24	.52
			P-S	.27	.59
			Control	.24	.55
Child is read to	12.39	<.01	PCEE	1.57	.52
			P-S	1.59 b, d	.51
			Control	1.34	.50
Child enjoys music	<1	n. s.	PCEE	1.79	.42
			P-S	1.82	.38
			Control	1.81	.41
Child goes to the library	25.73	<.005	PCEE	.97	.74
			P-S	.90 b, d	.73
			Control	.49	.65

(Continued)

APPENDIX E-2 (Continued)

Item	F		Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
Child watches Sesame Street	<1	n. s.	PCEE	1.61	.56
			P-S	1.64	.54
			Control	1.56	.63
Child goes shopping, visits interesting people and places in the community	5.44	<.01	PCEE	1.57	.54
			P-S	1.55 b, d	.56
			Control	1.40	.62
Child takes trips outside community	2.16	n. s.	PCEE	1.51	.55
			P-S	1.54	.54
			Control	1.42	.58

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the second project year program (N = 519); P-S = pupils with other preschool experience (N = 156); and, Control = pupils with no preschool experiences of any kind (N = 152).

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given in the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX F-1

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1972) on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
STAR I Picture Vocabulary	13.63 $p<.005$	PCEE	9.72	2.13
		P-S	9.78 b,d	2.46
		Control	8.94	2.43
II Letters	27.87 $p<.005$	PCEE	6.41	2.49
		P-S	6.34 b,d	2.56
		Control	5.08	2.99
III Picture Completion	3.69 $p<.05$	PCEE	4.57	1.60
		P-S	4.61 b,d	1.68
		Control	4.29	1.67
IV Copying	1.85 n.s.	PCEE	2.91	1.34
		P-S	3.02	1.44
		Control	2.79	1.32
V Picture Description	16.34 $p<.005$	PCEE	6.18	1.76
		P-S	5.83 b,d	1.87
		Control	5.49	1.79
VI Human Figure Drawing	16.29 $p<.005$	PCEE	9.81	3.13
		P-S	9.22 a,b,d	3.42
		Control	8.53	3.44
VII Relationships	10.89 $p<.005$	PCEE	6.73	1.39
		P-S	6.48 a,b	1.72
		Control	6.26	1.54

(Cont'd.)

APPENDIX F-1 (Contd.)

Variable	F	Group[1]	$\bar{X}$ and Duncan's Results[2]	Standard Deviation
VIII Numbers	20.78 p<.005	PCEE	8.69	3.71
		P-S	8.78 b,d	4.05
		Control	7.04	4.12
TOTAL	31.68 p<.005	PCEE	54.98	11.40
		P-S	53.97 a,b,d	13.49
		Control	48.23	13.68

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the first project year program (N = 681); pupils with Pre-School experience (N = 200); and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind (N = 302).

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given using the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX F-2

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering Kindergarten Pupils (1973) on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness

Variable			F	Group[1]	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
STAR	I	Picture Vocabulary	13.90 <.005	PCEE	10.12	2.04
				P-S	10.23 b, d	2.04
				Control	9.24	2.39
	II	Letters	40.52 <.005	PCEE	6.56	2.41
				P-S	6.68 b, d	2.54
				Control	4.76	2.69
	III	Picture Completion	14.61 <.005	PCEE	4.73	1.52
				P-S	4.79 b, d	1.78
				Control	4.03	1.78
	IV	Copying	5.64 <.025	PCEE	3.19	1.16
				P-S	3.19 b, d	1.50
				Control	2.84	1.36
	V	Picture Description	15.35 <.005	PCEE	6.30	1.76
				P-S	6.19 b, d	1.83
				Control	5.48	1.72
	VI	Human Figure Drawing	21.60 <.005	PCEE	10.27	3.31
				P-S	9.71 a, b, d	3.26
				Control	8.44	3.34
	VII	Relationships	15.92 <.005	PCEE	6.85	1.29
				P-S	6.67 b, d	1.84
				Control	6.15	1.66
	VIII	Numbers	41.26 <.005	PCEE	9.32	3.61
				P-S	9.54 b, d	3.85
				Control	6.62	3.84
TOTAL			48.73 <.005	PCEE	57.22	10.89
				P-S	56.48 b, d	12.90
				Control	47.64	12.83

(Continued)

APPENDIX F-2 (Continued)

[1] Entering kindergarteners were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the second project year (N = 602); P-S = pupils with other preschool experience (N = 182); and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind (N = 184).

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given using the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX G-1

Results of Analyses of Variance and Duncan's Multiple Range Tests with Extension for Unequal Replications for Entering First Grade Pupils (1973) on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II

SESAT II	F	Group[1]	N	Mean and Duncan's[2] Results	Standard Deviation
I Environment	11.41 < .005	PCEE	482	27.20	4.37
		P-S	192	27.18 b, d	4.90
		Control	267	25.60	4.86
II Math	13.10 < .005	PCEE	482	38.83	9.28
		P-S	192	39.10 b, d	9.44
		Control	267	35.40	9.92
III Letters & Sounds	7.12 < .01	PCEE	482	35.44	5.43
		P-S	192	35.24 b, d	5.95
		Control	267	33.79	6.47
IV Aural Comprehension	11.27 < .005	PCEE	482	19.00	3.32
		P-S	192	19.14 b, d	3.45
		Control	267	17.85	3.72
V Word Reading	7.42 < .01	PCEE	389	40.99	11.54
		P-S	163	39.06 b	11.84
		Control	202	37.12	11.97
VI Sentence Reading	3.11 n. s.	PCEE	307	17.99	10.07
		P-S	130	16.69	9.80
		Control	156	15.69	8.58
Total of First Four Subtests	15.19 < .005	PCEE	482	120.32	18.50
		P-S	192	120.66 b, d	19.85
		Control	267	112.67	20.80

---

[1] Entering first graders were identified as belonging to one of three groups: PCEE = pupils who had participated in the first project year; P-S = pupils with other preschool experience; and, Control = pupils with no preschool experience of any kind.

(Continued)

APPENDIX G-1 (Continued)

[2] Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests are given in the following codes:

a = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.
b = the PCEE mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
c = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
d = the Preschool mean was statistically significantly higher than the control group mean.
e = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the PCEE group mean.
f = the Control group mean was statistically significantly higher than the preschool group mean.

APPENDIX H-1a

Percentile Rank Norms Developed for Entering Kindergarten Pupils Using Data Collected on Pupils Entering Kindergarten Classes Within the District in the Fall of 1970 (N = 1505) on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness Subtests

Raw Score	Subtests I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
0		3	1	2	<1	1	<1	1
1	<1	10	4	11	<1	2	1	4
2	<1	18	10	18	2	2	2	9
3	1	25	23	35	6	3	5	15
4	2	32	32	75	14	5	10	22
5	4	40	48		31	10	18	29
6	10	49	81		56	18	33	35
7	14	69			72	24	58	41
8	21	83			82	31	86	49
9	39	85			96	43		59
10	61	93				57		67
11	73					64		75
12	85					71		82
13	96					84		89
14						93		93
15						98		97
16						99		
Reliability KR_{21}	.56	.80	.70	.68	.43	.71	.57	.83
Standard Error	1.52	1.33	.90	.68	1.36	1.83	1.06	1.66

APPENDIX H-1b

Percentile Rank Norms Developed for Entering Kindergarten Pupils Using Data Collected on Pupils Entering Kindergarten Classes Within the District in the Fall of 1970 (N = 1505) on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness Subtests

Raw Score	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank Range*	Raw Score	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank Range
10 or less	<1	<1	49	37	28-48
11-16	<1	<1-1	50	39	30-51
17-18	1	<1-2	51	42	31-54
19-20	1	1-2	52	45	34-57
21-22	2	1-3	53	48	37-60
23-24	2	1-4	54	51	39-63
25	3	2-5	55	54	42-66
26	3	2-6	56	57	45-70
27	4	2-7	57	60	48-73
28	4	2-8	58	63	51-75
29	5	3-9	59	66	54-78
30	6	3-10	60	70	57-81
31	7	4-11	61	73	60-84
32	8	4-12	62	75	63-87
33	9	5-15	63	78	66-89
34	10	6-16	64	81	70-91
35	11	7-17	65	84	73-93
36	12	8-18	66	87	75-95
37	15	9-20	67	89	78-97
38	15	10-22	68	91	81-97
39	17	11-24	69	93	84-98
40	18	12-26	70	95	87-99
41	20	15-28	71	97	89-99
42	22	15-30	72	97	91-99+
43	24	17-31	73	98	93-99+
44	26	18-34	74	99	95-99+
45	28	20-37	75-76	99	97-99+
46	30	22-39	77	99+	98-99+
47	31	24-42	78-79	99+	98-99+
48	34	26-45	80-81	99+	99+

*Percentile rank ranges were calculated using the Standard Error of Measurement ($SE_m = 4.08$) from the results of this sample ($KR_{21} = .90$).

APPENDIX H-1c

Summary of Results Obtained on the Screening Test of Academic Readiness Given to Kindergarten Pupils in 1970 (N = 1505) and 1971 (N = 1212)

Test	Sample	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	F	p
I	1970	9.45	9.54	2.31	<1	n.s.
	1971	9.41	9.57	2.26		
II	1970	5.44	6.05	2.96	<1	n.s.
	1971	5.48	5.59	2.84		
III	1970	4.51	5.07	1.64	<1	n.s.
	1971	4.46	5.03	1.66		
IV	1970	3.08	3.47	1.20	5.60	.025
	1971	2.97	3.46	1.31		
V	1970	5.90	5.80	1.82	<1	n.s.
	1971	5.82	5.75	1.80		
VI	1970	9.45	9.52	3.38	<1	n.s.
	1971	9.38	9.53	3.30		
VII	1970	6.37	6.74	1.61	<1	n.s.
	1971	6.35	6.68	1.59		
VIII	1970	7.84	8.11	4.04	<1	n.s.
	1971	7.78	8.01	4.09		
Total	1970	52.15	53.67	12.76	1.14	n.s.
	1971	51.62	53.03	13.01		

APPENDIX H-2a

Percentile Rank Equivalents for the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II Subtests Based on the Results of Pupils Entering First Grade in Fall, 1973 (N = 1007)*

Raw Score	Environment	Math	Letters and Sounds	Aural Comprehension	Word Reading	Sentence Reading
0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1
1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	2
2	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	3
3	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	4
4	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	6
5	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	7
6	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	9
7	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	11
8	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	13
9	<1	<1	<1	1	1	16
10	<1	<1	<1	1	1	22
11	<1	<1	<1	3	1	27
12	<1	<1	1	4	1	33
13	<1	<1	1	7	2	39
14	1	1	1	11	2	47
15	1	1	1	17	3	53
16	2	1	2	24	4	59
17	3	2	3	33	4	63
18	4	3	4	41	5	67
19	7	4	5	51	6	69
20	9	5	6	62	8	71
21	12	6	7	73	10	73
22	16	7	9	83	11	74
23	22	8	10	91	13	76
24	28	11	12	96	14	77
25	34	13	13	98	16	78
26	41	15	14	99	17	79
27	50	17	15	99+	19	80
28	59	19	16		21	81
29	67	22	18		22	82
30	75	24	20		24	83
31	82	26	22		25	85
32	87	29	24		27	86
33	91	31	28		30	88
34	95	34	33		33	90
35	98	37	38		36	92
36	99	40	46		39	95
37	99+	45	56		42	98
38	99+	49	67		44	99
39	99+	52	79		47	99+
40		55	90		51	
41		59	97		54	
42		63			57	

(continued)

APPENDIX H-2a (continued)

Raw Score	Environment	Math	Letters and Sounds	Aural Comprehension	Word Reading	Sentence Reading
43		66			60	
44		70			62	
45		73			65	
46		77			68	
47		80			71	
48		84			74	
49		87			77	
50		90			80	
51		93			83	
52		95			86	
53		97			88	
54		99			90	
55		99+			92	
56					94	
57					97	
58					99	

N	1007	1007	1007	1007	802	635
Mean	26.67	37.52	34.11	18.56	38.76	17.13
Median	27.03	38.28	36.41	19.35	39.71	14.49
Standard Deviation	4.73	9.97	6.63	3.54	11.94	9.72
Reliability	.64	.90	.89	.56	.93	.92
Standard Error	2.84	3.19	2.19	2.34	3.10	2.72

APPENDIX H-2b

Percentile Rank Norms Developed for Entering First Grade Pupils Using Data Collected on Pupils Entering First Grade Classes Within the District in the Fall of 1973 (N = 1007) on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level II Total Scores on the First Four Subtests

Raw Score	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank Range*	Raw Score	Percentile Rank	Percentile Rank Range
58 or less	1	1 - 1	117	43	34 - 53
59 - 66	1	1 - 2	118	45	35 - 54
67 - 71	2	1 - 3	119	47	37 - 56
72 - 74	3	2 - 4	120	48	39 - 59
75 - 78	4	2 - 5	121	50	41 - 60
79 - 80	5	4 - 7	122	53	43 - 63
81 - 82	6	4 - 8	123	54	45 - 65
83 - 84	7	5 - 9	124	56	47 - 67
85 - 86	8	6 - 10	125	59	48 - 68
87 - 88	9	7 - 12	126	60	50 - 71
89	10	7 - 13	127	63	53 - 74
90 - 91	11	8 - 14	128	65	54 - 76
92 - 93	12	9 - 15	129	67	56 - 78
94	13	10 - 18	130	68	59 - 79
95	14	11 - 19	131	71	60 - 81
96 - 97	15	12 - 20	132	74	63 - 84
98	16	12 - 23	133	76	65 - 85
99	18	13 - 24	134	78	67 - 88
100	19	14 - 25	135	79	68 - 90
101	20	15 - 26	136	81	71 - 91
102	22	15 - 27	137	84	74 - 92
103	23	16 - 28	138	85	76 - 93
104	24	18 - 29	139	88	78 - 94
105	25	19 - 31	140	90	79 - 95
106	26	20 - 32	141	91	81 - 96
107	27	22 - 34	142	92	84 - 96
108	28	23 - 35	143	93	85 - 97
109	29	24 - 37	144	94	88 - 98
110	31	25 - 39	145	95	90 - 99
111	32	26 - 41	146-147	96	91 - 99
112	34	27 - 43	148	97	93 - 99+
113	35	28 - 45	149	98	94 - 99+
114	37	29 - 47	150-151	99	95 - 99+
115	39	31 - 48	152 & above	99+	97 - 99+
116	41	32 - 50			

Number of Items	162
N	1007
Mean	117.31
Median	120.83
Standard Deviation	20.98
Reliability	.94
Standard Error	5.04

APPENDIX H-3a

Percentile Rank Equivalent for the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Level I Subtests Based on the Results of Pupils Entering Second Grade in Fall, 1973 (*N* = 987)

					MATH		
Score	Vocabulary	Reading A	Reading B	Word Study Skills	Concepts	Comprehension and Application	Listening Comprehension
0-7	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
8-9	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1	<1
10	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1	1
11	1	<1	1	<1	<1	2	1
12	1	<1	1	<1	1	2	2
13	1	<1	1	<1	1	3	2
14	1	<1	2	<1	3	4	4
15	2	<1	3	<1	4	4	6
16	3	1	4	<1	5	5	8
17	4	1	5	<1	8	6	11
18	5	2	6	<1	11	7	16
19	6	2	7	<1	14	10	24
20	7	3	9	<1	17	12	32
21	9	3	11	<1	21	15	41
22	11	3	13	<1	27	18	54
23	14	4	15	<1	34	22	68
24	17	6	16	<1	42	28	82
25	20	8	18	1	50	35	93
26	25	9	20	1	59	42	98
27	31	10	21	1	69	51	
28	37	11	22	1	78	60	
29	43	13	23	1	86	71	
30	51	14	24	2	93	81	
31	59	16	25	2	96	87	

(continued)

APPENDIX H-3a (continued)

Score	Vocabulary	Reading		Word Study Skills	MATH		Listening Comprehension
		A	B		Concepts	Comprehension and Application	
32	67	18	27	2	98	94	
33	75	20	29	3			
34	83	22	31	3			
35	90	24	33	4			
36	94	27	35	4			
37	97	30	39	5			
38		33	43	6			
39		37	50	7			
40		41	60	9			
41		46	75	10			
42		54	92	11			
43		63		14			
44		73		16			
45		90		18			
46				20			
47				23			
48				25			
49				28			
50				30			
51				30			
52				37			
53				40			
54				44			
55				48			
56				54			
57				61			
58				69			
59				81			
60				94			

(continued)

APPENDIX H-3a (continued)

		Reading			Math		
	Vocabulary	A	B	Word Study Skills	Concepts	Comprehension & Application	Listening Comprehension
Number of items in subtest	37	45	42	60	32	32	26
Mean	29.99	38.64	34.91	52.44	24.30	25.88	21.05
Median	29.92	41.66	38.99	55.31	25.00	26.93	21.71
Standard Deviation	5.36	7.21	8.42	7.77	4.48	4.99	3.32
Reliability (KR_{21})	.82	.89	.94	.91	.73	.83	.66
Standard Error	2.27	2.39	2.06	2.33	2.33	2.06	1.94

APPENDIX H-3b

Percentile Rank Equivalents for the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Level I Combined Subtests Based on the Results of Pupils Entering Second Grade in Fall, 1973 (N = 987)

Score	Reading A + B	Total Auditory	Total Math
0-21	<1	<1	<1
22	<1	<1	1
23	<1	<1	1
24	<1	1	1
25	<1	1	1
26	<1	1	2
27	<1	1	2
28	<1	1	3
29	<1	2	3
30	1	2	3
31	1	2	4
32	1	3	5
33	1	3	5
34	2	4	6
35	2	5	7
36	2	6	8
37	3	7	10
38	3	8	11
39	4	9	12
40	4	10	13
41	5	12	14
42	6	15	16
43	6	17	18
44	8	20	21
45	9	23	23
46	10	27	26
47	11	30	29
48	12	34	32
49	13	38	36
50	14	43	41
51	14	48	46
52	15	53	51
53	16	58	57
54	17	64	62
55	18	70	67
56	19	76	72
57	20	82	77
58	20	87	82
59	21	91	87
60	22	95	90
61	23	97	93
62	25	99	96

(continued)

APPENDIX H-3b (continued)

Score	Reading A + B	Total Auditory	Total Math
63	25	99+	98
64	26		99
65	27		
66	28		
67	30		
68	31		
69	31		
70	32		
71	33		
72	34		
73	36		
74	37		
75	38		
76	40		
77	42		
78	45		
79	47		
80	49		
81	52		
82	57		
83	63		
84	70		
85	79		
86	88		
87	96		

Number of items in sub-test	87	63	64
Mean	72.64	50.04	50.18
Median	80.17	51.49	51.79
Standard Deviation	15.58	7.74	8.81
Reliability (KR_{21})	.96	.84	.87
Standard Error	3.12	3.10	3.18

APPENDIX H-3c

Percentile Rank Equivalents for the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Level I Total Reading and Total Battery Based on Results of Pupils Entering Second Grade in Fall, 1973 ($\underline{N}$ = 987)

Score	Total Reading	Total Battery
0-35	<1	<1
36-63	1	<1
54-69	2	<1
70-73	3	<1
74-76	4	<1
77-79	5	<1
80-81	6	<1
82-84	7	<1
85	8	<1
86-87	9	<1
88	10	<1
89-90	11	<1
91-92	12	<1
93	13	<1
94-95	14	<1
96-97	15	<1
98	16	<1
99-100	17	<1
101-102	18	<1
103-104	19	<1
105	20	<1
106	21	<1
107-108	22	<1
109	23	<1
110	24	<1
111-112	25	<1
113	26	<1
114-115	27	<1
116-117	28	<1
118	29	<1

(Continued)

Score	Total Reading	Total Battery
119	30	<1
120	31	1
121	32	1
122-123	33	1
124	34	1
125	35	1
126	36	1
127	37	1
128	38	1
129	39	1
130	41	1
131	43	1
132	44	1
133	45	1
134	47	1
135	49	2
136	50	2
137	52	2
138	54	2
139	57	2
140	61	3
141	65	3
142	70	3
143	75	3
144	81	3
145	88	4
146	94	4
147	98	4
148-152		4
153-156		5

(Continued)

APPENDIX H-3c (continued)

Score	Total Reading	Total Battery
157-158		6
159-164		7
165-167		8
168-170		9
171-173		10
174-175		11
176-177		12
178-182		13
183-184		14
185-187		15
188-190		16
191		17
192-193		18
194-195		19
196		20
197		21
198-199		22
200-202		23
203-204		24
205-206		25
207		26
208		27
209		28
210-212		29
213		30
214-215		31
216-218		32
219-220		33
221		34
222		35
223-224		36
225		38
226-227		39
228		40
229		41
230		42
231		43
232		44
233		45
234		46
235		48
236		49
237		50
238		52
239		54
240		55
241		57
242		58
243		59
244		60
245		61
246		63
247		65
248		67
249		69
250		72
251		73
252		75
253		77

(continued)

(continued)

APPENDIX H-3c (continued)

Score	Total Reading	Total Battery
254		79
255		80
256		82
257		84
258		85
259		87
260		88
261		90
262		92
263		94
264		95
265		96
266		97
267-268		98
269-271		99
272 and above		99+

Number of items	147	274
Mean	125.25	225.56
Median	135.82	236.68
Standard Deviation	23.46	34.97
Reliability (KR_{21})	.97	.97
Standard Error	4.06	6.06

APPENDIX H-4

Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Skill Development During the First Project Year (N=748)

Skill Objectives	Prior to October	October November	Date of Achievement		April May	Not Achieved	Blank
			December January	February March			
1. Identifies 6 or more colors	397 (54%)	227 (31%)	45 (6%)	24 (3%)	14 (2%)	28 (4%)	13
2. Identifies shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	116 (16%)	356 (48%)	119 (16%)	64 (9%)	51 (7%)	33 (4%)	9
3. Touches and names parts of the body	340 (46%)	322 (44%)	39 (5%)	19 (3%)	6 (1%)	8 (1%)	14
4. Speaks in sentences of five or more words	578 (78%)	96 (13%)	33 (4%)	18 (2%)	8 (1%)	6 (1%)	9
5. Articulates clearly	521 (71%)	99 (13%)	9 (1%)	13 (2%)	9 (1%)	83 (11%)	14
6. Tells his whole name	311 (42%)	286 (39%)	49 (7%)	37 (5%)	27 (4%)	24 (3%)	14
7. Counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	311 (42%)	215 (29%)	116 (16%)	42 (6%)	21 (3%)	29 (4%)	14
8 Throws and catches a ball	205 (28%)	341 (46%)	115 (16%)	36 (5%)	23 (3%)	14 (2%)	14
9. Uses crayons with control	225 (31%)	275 (37%)	124 (17%)	62 (8%)	30 (4%)	18 (2%)	14
10. Uses scissors with control	135 (18%)	267 (36%)	182 (25%)	70 (10%)	45 (6%)	35 (5%)	14

APPENDIX H-4 (continued)

Skill Objectives	Prior to October	October November	December January	February March	April May	Not Achieved	Blank
			Date of Achievement				
11. Identifies size differences: big, little; long, short; etc.	110 (15%)	305 (41%)	228 (31%)	49 (7%)	36 (5%)	15 (2%)	5
12. Sequences rods, objects from shortest to longest	53 (7%)	276 (37%)	276 (37%)	63 (8%)	45 (6%)	29 (4%)	6
13. Identifies and constructs sets of 1 to 5	75 (10%)	270 (36%)	263 (35%)	45 (6%)	56 (8%)	32 (4%)	7
14. Reproduces shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	20 (3%)	148 (20%)	199 (27%)	161 (22%)	102 (14%)	113 (15%)	5
15. Works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	106 (14%)	274 (37%)	249 (33%)	47 (6%)	32 (4%)	36 (5%)	4
16. Walks a balance beam without stepping off	26 (4%)	208 (30%)	275 (40%)	101 (15%)	70 (10%)	15 (2%)	53
17. Demonstrates orientation concepts: in, out; around, through; etc.	45 (6%)	168 (23%)	384 (52%)	75 (10%)	53 (7%)	19 (3%)	4
18. Takes turns and shares	114 (15%)	361 (48%)	154 (21%)	67 (9%)	25 (3%)	24 (3%)	3
19. Expresses feelings in acceptable ways	115 (15%)	293 (39%)	179 (24%)	59 (8%)	58 (8%)	40 (5%)	4
20. Describes objects as to size, weight, texture	11 (1%)	22 (3%)	395 (53%)	206 (28%)	63 (8%)	50 (7%)	1
21. Identifies and constructs sets of 0 - 10	28 (4%)	29 (4%)	278 (38%)	141 (19%)	102 (14%)	155 (21%)	15

APPENDIX H-4 (continued)

Skill Objectives	Prior to October	October November	Date of Achievement December January	February March	April May	Not Achieved	Blank
22. Recognizes numerals 1-5	67 (9%)	92 (12%)	371 (50%)	115 (15%)	51 (7%)	52 (7%)	0
23. Recognizes numerals 0-10	27 (4%)	63 (9%)	218 (32%)	192 (28%)	70 (10%)	118 (17%)	60
24. Reproduces a simple pattern from memory	0 (0%)	103 (14%)	284 (38%)	138 (19%)	158 (21%)	59 (8%)	6
25. Follows a series of two or more directions given simultaneously	17 (2%)	32 (4%)	228 (31%)	289 (39%)	131 (18%)	48 (6%)	3
26. Claps or marches in time with music	6 (1%)	14 (2%)	254 (34%)	211 (28%)	143 (19%)	120 (16%)	0
27. Follows left to right progression in tracking and drawing	4 (1%)	20 (3%)	247 (33%)	160 (21%)	190 (25%)	126 (17%)	1
28. Associates numerals 1 to 5 with their corresponding sets	28 (4%)	58 (8%)	269 (37%)	241 (33%)	80 (11%)	51 (7%)	21
29. Associates numerals 0 to 10 with their corresponding sets	7 (1%)	33 (5%)	99 (14%)	264 (37%)	118 (16%)	201 (28%)	26
30. Identifies a few letters of the alphabet	84 (11%)	62 (8%)	110 (15%)	299 (41%)	99 (14%)	77 (11%)	17
31. Identifies many letters of the alphabet	17 (2%)	29 (4%)	91 (13%)	199 (27%)	134 (19%)	254 (35%)	24
32. Distinguishes words that rhyme	0 (0%)	3 (<1%)	16 (2%)	269 (37%)	221 (30%)	220 (30%)	19

APPENDIX H-4 (continued)

Skill Objectives	Prior to October	October November	Date of Achievement December January	February March	April May	Not Achieved	Blank
33. Includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	4 (1%)	11 (1%)	72 (10%)	300 (41%)	213 (29%)	136 (18%)	12
34. Shows self-confidence in trying new activities	35 (5%)	104 (15%)	117 (17%)	257 (37%)	109 (15%)	82 (12%)	44
35. Tells how things are alike or different, as to size, shape, color, etc.	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	72 (10%)	159 (22%)	341 (47%)	149 (21%)	23
36. Makes relevant verbal contributions in group conversation or discussion	5 (1%)	15 (2%)	71 (10%)	140 (20%)	303 (43%)	166 (24%)	48
37. Understands and applies the terms more than and less than	0 (0%)	17 (2%)	47 (6%)	114 (15%)	404 (55%)	158 (21%)	8
38. Prints his first name correctly	2 (<1%)	29 (4%)	125 (17%)	148 (20%)	275 (38%)	148 (20%)	21
39. Consistently completes a task	11 (2%)	72 (10%)	107 (15%)	154 (22%)	256 (36%)	111 (16%)	37

APPENDIX H-5

A Summary of Teachers' Ratings of PCEE Pupils' Skill Development (N = 680)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved	Blank
Personal and Social Development				
1. Child takes turns and shares	445 (65%)	191 (28%)	44 (6%)	0
2. Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways	404 (59%)	190 (28%)	86 (13%)	0
3. Child consistently completes a task	299 (44%)	261 (38%)	120 (18%)	0
4. Child shows self confidence in trying out new activities	313 (46%)	265 (39%)	102 (15%)	0
Language Development				
1. Child speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	641 (94%)	31 (5%)	8 (1%)	0
2. Child articulates clearly	558 (82%)	44 (6%)	78 (11%)	0
3. Child tells his whole name	603 (89%)	70 (10%)	7 (1%)	0
4. Child touches and names parts of the body	576 (85%)	91 (13%)	13 (2%)	0
5. Child describes objects as to size, weight, texture	151 (22%)	415 (61%)	113 (17%)	1
6. Child tells how things are alike or different as to size, shape, color, etc.	105 (15%)	425 (62%)	150 (22%)	0
7. Child follows a series of two or more directions	252 (37%)	344 (51%)	83 (12%)	1
8. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	271 (40%)	367 (54%)	42 (6%)	0

Continued

APPENDIX H-5 (Continued)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved	Blank
9. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	132 (19%)	329 (48%)	219 (32%)	0
10. Child distinguishes words that rhyme	60 (9%)	426 (63%)	194 (29%)	0
11. Child makes relevant verbal contributions in group conversation or discussion	133 (20%)	424 (62%)	123 (18%)	0
Math and Science Concept Development				
1. Child identifies 6 or more colors	551 (81%)	92 (14%)	37 (5%)	0
2. Child identifies shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	505 (74%)	135 (20%)	40 (6%)	0
3. Child reproduces above shapes	271 (40%)	280 (41%)	129 (19%)	0
4. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	539 (79%)	115 (17%)	26 (4%)	0
5. Child identifies size differences: big, little, long, short, etc.	517 (76%)	142 (21%)	21 (3%)	0
6. Child sequences rods, objects from shortest to longest	491 (72%)	139 (20%)	50 (7%)	0
7. Child reproduces a simple pattern from memory	250 (37%)	364 (54%)	66 (10%)	0
8. Child identifies and constructs sets of 1 to 5	486 (71%)	162 (24%)	32 (5%)	0
9. Child identifies and constructs sets of 0 to 10	256 (38%)	296 (44%)	128 (19%)	0

Continued

APPENDIX H-5 (Continued)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved	Blank
10. Child recognizes numerals 1 to 5	480 (71%)	168 (25%)	32 (5%)	0
11. Child recognizes numerals 0 to 10	281 (41%)	247 (36%)	152 (22%)	0
12. Child associates numerals 1 to 5 with their corresponding sets	246 (36%)	388 (57%)	46 (7%)	0
13. Child associates numerals 0 to 10 with their corresponding sets	137 (20%)	359 (53%)	184 (27%)	0
14. Child understands and applies the terms more than, less than	111 (16%)	469 (69%)	100 (15%)	0
Motor Skill Development				
1. Child throws and catches a ball	532 (78%)	124 (18%)	23 (3%)	1
2. Child walks a balance beam without stepping off	244 (36%)	376 (55%)	59 (9%)	1
3. Child demonstrates orientation concepts: in-out, around-through, etc.	455 (67%)	198 (29%)	26 (4%)	1
4. Child claps or marches in time to music	144 (21%)	441 (65%)	95 (14%)	0
5. Child uses crayons with control	509 (75%)	152 (22%)	19 (3%)	0
6. Child uses scissors with control	444 (65%)	188 (28%)	48 (7%)	0
7. Child works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	450 (66%)	180 (26%)	50 (7%)	0
8. Child includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	78 (11%)	427 (63%)	175 (26%)	0

Continued

APPENDIX H-5 (Continued)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved	Blank
9. Child follows left to right progression in tracking and drawing	108 (16%)	391 (58%)	181 (27%)	0
10. Child prints his first name correctly	162 (24%)	364 (54%)	153 (22%)	1

APPENDIX H-6

A Summary of Teachers' Rating of Third Year PCEE Pupils' Skill Development (N = 693)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved
Personal and Social Development			
1. Child takes turns and shares	478 (69%)	177 (26%)	38 (5%)
2. Child expresses feelings in acceptable ways	384 (55%)	222 (32%)	87 (13%)
3. Child consistently completes a task	310 (45%)	237 (34%)	146 (21%)
4. Child shows self confidence in trying out new activities	316 (46%)	233 (34%)	144 (21%)
Language Development			
1. Child speaks in sentences of 5 or more words	640 (92%)	41 (6%)	12 (2%)
2. Child articulates clearly	405 (58%)	275 (40%)	13 (2%)
3. Child tells his whole name	592 (85%)	88 (13%)	13 (2%)
4. Child touches and names parts of the body	576 (83%)	105 (15%)	12 (2%)
5. Child describes objects as to size, weight, and texture	211 (30%)	405 (58%)	77 (11%)
6. Child tells how things are alike or different as to size, shape, color, etc.	268 (39%)	386 (56%)	39 (6%)

(continued)

APPENDIX H-6 (continued

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved
7. Child follows a series of two or more directions	67 (10%)	462 (67%)	164 (24%)
8. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	80 (12%)	496 (71%)	117 (17%)
9. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	125 (18%)	345 (50%)	223 (32%)
10. Child distinguishes words that rhyme	54 (8%)	413 (60%)	226 (33%)
11. Child makes relevant verbal contributions in group conversation or discussion	192 (28%)	353 (51%)	148 (21%)
Math and Science Concept Development			
1. Child identifies 6 or more colors	214 (31%)	388 (56%)	91 (13%)
2. Child identifies shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	531 (77%)	99 (14%)	63 (9%)
3. Child reproduces above shapes	477 (69%)	172 (25%)	44 (6%)
4. Child counts from 1 to 10 or beyond	522 (75%)	120 (17%)	50 (7%)
5. Child identifies size differences: big, little, long, short, etc.	527 (76%)	149 (21%)	17 (2%)

(continued)

APPENDIX H-6 (continued

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved
6. Child sequences rods, objects from shortest to longest	473 (68%)	178 (26%)	42 (6%)
7. Child reproduces a simple pattern from memory	486 (70%)	169 (24%)	38 (5%)
8. Child identifies and constructs sets of 1 to 5	200 (29%)	349 (50%)	144 (21%)
9. Child identifies and constructs sets of 0 to 10	133 (19%)	532 (77%)	28 (4%)
10. Child recognizes numerals 1 to 5	314 (45%)	284 (41%)	95 (14%)
11. Child recognizes numerals 0 to 10	396 (57%)	251 (36%)	46 (7%)
12. Child associates numerals 1 to 5 with their corresponding sets	179 (26%)	351 (51%)	163 (23%)
13. Child associates numerals 0 to 10 with their corresponding sets	205 (30%)	363 (52%)	125 (18%)
14. Child understands and applies the terms more than, less than	467 (67%)	191 (28%)	35 (5%)
Motor Skill Development			
1. Child catches and throws a ball	311 (45%)	306 (44%)	76 (11%)

(continued)

APPENDIX H-6 (continued)

Item	Achieved as of January	Achieved as of June	Not yet achieved
2. Child walks a balance beam without stepping off	430 (62%)	244 (35%)	19 (3%)
3. Child demonstrates orientation concepts: in-out, around-through, etc.	183 (26%)	372 (54%)	138 (20%)
4. Child claps or marches in time to music	413 (60%)	258 (37%)	22 (3%)
5. Child uses crayons with control	339 (49%)	296 (43%)	58 (8%)
6. Child uses scissors with control	346 (50%)	295 (43%)	52 (7%)
7. Child works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	124 (18%)	440 (63%)	129 (19%)
8. Child includes major body parts and features in drawing a person	28 (4%)	447 (64%)	218 (31%)
9. Child follows left to right progression in tracking and drawing	149 (21%)	351 (51%)	193 (28%)
10. Child prints his first name correctly	191 (28%)	360 (52%)	142 (20%)

APPENDIX H-7

Initial Parent Ratings of Pupils' Behavior on the Items of "My Preschool Child" Made Prior to Entry Into the PCEE Program in the Fall, 1973 (N = 727)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
1. Child dresses himself	Total*	440 (61%)	262 (36%)	21 (3%)	4
	H	239 (56%)	169 (40%)	17 (4%)	3
	NH	201 (67%)	93 (31%)	4 (1%)	1
2. Child buttons, snaps, and zips his clothing	Total	358 (50%)	329 (45%)	36 (5%)	4
	H	189 (44%)	212 (50%)	24 (6%)	3
	NH	169 (57%)	117 (39%)	12 (4%)	1
3. Child goes to the toilet by himself	Total	670 (92%)	48 (7%)	5 (1%)	4
	H	386 (91%)	34 (8%)	5 (1%)	3
	NH	284 (95%)	14 (5%)	0 (0%)	1
4. Child pays attention and concentrates well	Total	252 (35%)	461 (64%)	10 (1%)	4
	H	129 (30%)	288 (68%)	8 (2%)	3
	NH	123 (41%)	173 (58%)	2 (1%)	1
5. Child follows simple directions without reminding	Total	297 (41%)	418 (58%)	8 (1%)	4
	H	158 (37%)	263 (62%)	4 (1%)	3
	NH	139 (47%)	155 (52%)	4 (1%)	1
6. Child tells what he wants or needs	Total	669 (93%)	51 (7%)	3 (<1%)	4
	H	384 (90%)	38 (9%)	3 (1%)	3
	NH	285 (96%)	13 (4%)	0 (0%)	1
7. Child helps with simple household jobs	Total	387 (54%)	328 (45%)	8 (1%)	4
	H	213 (50%)	204 (48%)	8 (2%)	3
	NH	174 (58%)	124 (42%)	0 (0%)	1
8. Child takes turns and shares with other children	Total	356 (49%)	360 (50%)	7 (1%)	4
	H	183 (43%)	237 (56%)	5 (1%)	3
	NH	173 (58%)	123 (41%)	2 (1%)	1
9. Child takes good care of things he uses	Total	319 (44%)	373 (52%)	31 (4%)	4
	H	165 (39%)	237 (56%)	23 (5%)	3
	NH	154 (52%)	136 (46%)	8 (3%)	1
10. Child prefers to play alone	Total	28 (4%)	536 (74%)	158 (22%)	5
	H	18 (4%)	317 (75%)	90 (21%)	3
	NH	10 (3%)	219 (73%)	68 (23%)	2

(continued)

APPENDIX H-7 (continued)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
11. Child plays with a few children	Total	389 (54%)	324 (45%)	9 (1%)	5
	H	216 (51%)	204 (48%)	5 (1%)	3
	NH	173 (58%)	120 (40%)	4 (1%)	2
12. Child plays with many children	Total	223 (31%)	399 (55%)	100 (14%)	5
	H	132 (31%)	225 (53%)	68 (16%)	3
	NH	91 (31%)	174 (58%)	32 (11%)	2
13. Child remembers rules of games he plays	Total	250 (35%)	402 (56%)	71 (10%)	4
	H	118 (28%)	252 (59%)	55 (13%)	3
	NH	132 (44%)	150 (50%)	16 (5%)	1
14. Child speaks in sentences of five words or more	Total	672 (93%)	41 (6%)	10 (1%)	4
	H	383 (90%)	33 (8%)	9 (2%)	3
	NH	289 (97%)	8 (3%)	1 (<1%)	1
15. Child tells a simple story	Total	455 (63%)	220 (30%)	48 (7%)	4
	H	243 (57%)	141 (33%)	41 (10%)	3
	NH	212 (71%)	79 (27%)	7 (2%)	1
16. Child identifies six or more colors	Total	505 (70%)	102 (14%)	116 (16%)	4
	H	258 (61%)	73 (17%)	94 (22%)	3
	NH	247 (83%)	29 (10%)	22 (7%)	1
17. Child recites rhymes, sings songs	Total	399 (55%)	262 (36%)	62 (9%)	4
	H	200 (47%)	174 (41%)	51 (12%)	3
	NH	199 (67%)	88 (30%)	11 (4%)	1
18. Child tells how things are alike or different	Total	362 (50%)	313 (43%)	48 (7%)	4
	H	175 (41%)	210 (49%)	40 (9%)	3
	NH	187 (63%)	103 (35%)	8 (3%)	1
19. Child identifies a few letters of the alphabet	Total	412 (57%)	179 (25%)	132 (18%)	4
	H	193 (45%)	125 (29%)	107 (25%)	3
	NH	219 (73%)	54 (18%)	25 (8%)	1
20. Child identifies many letters of the alphabet	Total	282 (39%)	121 (17%)	320 (44%)	4
	H	123 (29%)	69 (16%)	233 (55%)	3
	NH	159 (53%)	52 (17%)	87 (29%)	1
21. Child prints his first name correctly	Total	202 (28%)	139 (19%)	382 (53%)	4
	H	83 (20%)	67 (16%)	275 (65%)	3
	NH	119 (40%)	72 (24%)	107 (36%)	1
22. Child tells his whole name	Total	567 (78%)	104 (14%)	52 (7%)	4
	H	305 (72%)	80 (19%)	40 (9%)	3
	NH	262 (88%)	24 (8%)	12 (4%)	1

(continued)

APPENDIX H-7 (continued)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
23. Child tells his address	Total	156 (22%)	218 (30%)	349 (48%)	4
	H	67 (16%)	121 (28%)	237 (56%)	3
	NH	89 (30%)	97 (33%)	112 (38%)	1
24. Child tells his telephone number	Total	91 (13%)	92 (13%)	540 (75%)	4
	H	38 (9%)	41 (10%)	346 (81%)	3
	NH	53 (18%)	51 (17%)	194 (65%)	1
25. Child counts from one to ten or beyond	Total	565 (78%)	103 (14%)	55 (8%)	4
	H	303 (71%)	77 (18%)	45 (11%)	3
	NH	262 (88%)	26 (9%)	10 (3%)	1
26. Child recognizes numerals 1 to 10	Total	310 (43%)	222 (31%)	191 (26%)	4
	H	131 (31%)	144 (34%)	150 (35%)	3
	NH	179 (60%)	78 (26%)	41 (14%)	1
27. Child tells "how many" in a group of objects	Total	413 (57%)	248 (34%)	62 (9%)	4
	H	200 (47%)	174 (41%)	51 (12%)	3
	NH	213 (71%)	74 (25%)	11 (4%)	1
28. Child identifies basic shapes: circle, square, triangle, rectangle	Total	310 (43%)	283 (39%)	130 (18%)	4
	H	153 (36%)	172 (40%)	100 (24%)	3
	NH	157 (53%)	111 (37%)	30 (10%)	1
29. Child throws and catches a ball	Total	456 (63%)	250 (35%)	17 (2%)	4
	H	261 (61%)	155 (36%)	9 (2%)	3
	NH	195 (65%)	95 (32%)	8 (3%)	1
30. Child can ride a tricycle or bicycle	Total	694 (96%)	22 (3%)	7 (1%)	4
	H	402 (95%)	18 (4%)	5 (1%)	3
	NH	292 (98%)	4 (1%)	2 (<1%)	1
31. Child runs, hops, and jumps	Total	681 (94%)	36 (5%)	6 (1%)	4
	H	395 (93%)	25 (6%)	5 (1%)	3
	NH	286 (96%)	11 (4%)	1 (<1%)	1
32. Child claps or marches in time to music	Total	436 (60%)	250 (35%)	37 (5%)	4
	H	253 (60%)	148 (35%)	24 (6%)	3
	NH	183 (61%)	102 (34%)	13 (4%)	1
33. Child uses crayons with control	Total	419 (58%)	244 (34%)	60 (8%)	4
	H	223 (52%)	157 (37%)	45 (11%)	3
	NH	196 (66%)	87 (29%)	15 (5%)	1

(continued)

APPENDIX H-7 (continued)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
34. Child uses scissors with control	Total	258 (36%)	321 (44%)	144 (20%)	4
	H	136 (32%)	188 (44%)	101 (24%)	3
	NH	122 (41%)	133 (45%)	43 (14%)	1
35. Child works a puzzle of 10 or more pieces	Total	377 (52%)	246 (34%)	100 (14%)	4
	H	179 (42%)	171 (40%)	75 (18%)	3
	NH	198 (66%)	75 (25%)	25 (8%)	1
36. Child enjoys looking at books	Total	625 (86%)	96 (13%)	2 (<1%)	4
	H	360 (85%)	64 (15%)	1 (<1%)	3
	NH	265 (89%)	32 (11%)	1 (<1%)	1
37. Child listens to stories and music	Total	617 (85%)	104 (14%)	2 (<1%)	4
	H	354 (83%)	71 (17%)	0 (0%)	3
	NH	263 (88%)	33 (11%)	2 (1%)	1
38. Child is read to	Total	437 (60%)	269 (37%)	17 (2%)	4
	H	233 (55%)	175 (41%)	17 (4%)	3
	NH	204 (68%)	94 (32%)	0 (0%)	1
39. Child uses paint	Total	275 (38%)	313 (43%)	135 (19%)	4
	H	139 (33%)	192 (45%)	94 (22%)	3
	NH	136 (46%)	121 (41%)	41 (14%)	1
40. Child uses playdoh or clay	Total	284 (39%)	357 (49%)	82 (11%)	4
	H	139 (33%)	221 (52%)	65 (15%)	3
	NH	145 (49%)	136 (46%)	17 (6%)	1
41. Child uses scissors	Total	311 (43%)	327 (45%)	85 (12%)	4
	H	149 (35%)	212 (50%)	64 (15%)	3
	NH	162 (54%)	115 (39%)	21 (7%)	1
42. Child uses crayons	Total	537 (74%)	173 (24%)	13 (2%)	4
	H	288 (68%)	128 (30%)	9 (2%)	3
	NH	249 (84%)	45 (15%)	4 (1%)	1
43. Child has visited the zoo	Total	295 (41%)	394 (54%)	34 (5%)	4
	H	163 (38%)	233 (55%)	29 (7%)	3
	NH	132 (44%)	161 (54%)	5 (2%)	1
44. Child has been to the library	Total	254 (35%)	244 (34%)	225 (31%)	4
	H	114 (27%)	149 (35%)	162 (38%)	3
	NH	140 (47%)	95 (32%)	63 (21%)	1

(continued)

APPENDIX H-7 (continued)

Item		2 Regularly	1 Sometimes	0 Not Yet	Blank
45. Child has taken field trips outside the community	Total	437 (60%)	268 (37%)	18 (2%)	4
	H	251 (59%)	161 (38%)	13 (3%)	3
	NH	186 (62%)	107 (36%)	5 (2%)	1
46. Child attends or has attended Nursery School, Headstart, Sunday School	Total	345 (48%)	95 (13%)	283 (39%)	4
	H	198 (47%)	57 (13%)	170 (40%)	3
	NH	147 (49%)	38 (13%)	113 (38%)	1
47. Child watches Sesame Street	Total	433 (60%)	236 (33%)	54 (7%)	4
	H	226 (53%)	158 (37%)	41 (10%)	3
	NH	207 (69%)	78 (26%)	13 (4%)	1

Item		2 Often	1 Once in a while	0 Not at all	Blank
48. Child has trouble with eating (too much or too little)	Total	69 (10%)	343 (47%)	311 (43%)	4
	H	50 (12%)	218 (51%)	157 (37%)	3
	NH	19 (6%)	125 (42%)	154 (52%)	1
49. Child has trouble with sleeping (too much or too little)	Total	31 (4%)	170 (24%)	522 (72%)	4
	H	27 (6%)	130 (31%)	268 (63%)	3
	NH	4 (1%)	40 (13%)	254 (85%)	1
50. Child has trouble with stomach irregularities	Total	7 (1%)	125 (17%)	591 (82%)	4
	H	5 (1%)	84 (20%)	336 (79%)	3
	NH	2 (1%)	41 (14%)	255 (86%)	1
51. Child has trouble with getting along with other children	Total	69 (10%)	370 (51%)	284 (39%)	4
	H	65 (15%)	213 (50%)	147 (35%)	3
	NH	4 (1%)	157 (53%)	137 (46%)	1
52. Child has trouble with getting along with adults	Total	80 (11%)	192 (27%)	451 (62%)	4
	H	74 (17%)	119 (28%)	232 (55%)	3
	NH	6 (2%)	73 (24%)	219 (73%)	1
53. Child has trouble with unusual fears	Total	17 (2%)	241 (33%)	465 (64%)	4
	H	16 (4%)	153 (36%)	256 (60%)	3
	NH	1 (1%)	88 (30%)	209 (70%)	1

(continued)

APPENDIX H-7 (continued

Item		2 Often	1 Once in a while	0 Not at all	Blank
54. Child has trouble with nervousness	Total	23 (3%)	203 (28%)	497 (69%)	4
	H	22 (5%)	134 (32%)	269 (63%)	3
	NH	1 (<1%)	69 (23%)	228 (77%)	1
55. Child has trouble with thumbsucking	Total	73 (10%)	63 (9%)	587 (81%)	4
	H	48 (11%)	39 (9%)	338 (80%)	3
	NH	25 (8%)	24 (8%)	249 (84%)	1
56. Child has trouble with overactivity	Total	66 (9%)	224 (31%)	432 (60%)	5
	H	61 (14%)	134 (32%)	230 (54%)	3
	NH	5 (2%)	90 (30%)	202 (68%)	2
57. Child has trouble with sex	Total	2 (2%)	51 (7%)	668 (92%)	6
	H	2 (<1%)	33 (8%)	388 (91%)	5
	NH	0 (0%)	18 (6%)	280 (94%)	1
58. Child has trouble with daydreaming	Total	9 (1%)	177 (25%)	536 (74%)	5
	H	5 (1%)	131 (31%)	289 (68%)	3
	NH	4 (1%)	46 (15%)	247 (83%)	2
59. Child has trouble with temper tantrums	Total	32 (4%)	382 (53%)	309 (43%)	4
	H	30 (7%)	239 (56%)	156 (37%)	3
	NH	2 (1%)	143 (48%)	153 (51%)	1
60. Child has trouble with crying	Total	42 (6%)	434 (60%)	247 (34%)	4
	H	39 (9%)	261 (61%)	125 (29%)	3
	NH	3 (1%)	173 (58%)	122 (41%)	1
61. Child has trouble with lying	Total	12 (2%)	291 (40%)	420 (58%)	4
	H	10 (2%)	178 (42%)	237 (56%)	3
	NH	2 (1%)	113 (38%)	183 (61%)	1
62. Child has trouble with stealing	Total	0 (0%)	41 (5%)	681 (94%)	5
	H	0 (0%)	32 (8%)	392 (92%)	4
	NH	0 (0%)	9 (3%)	289 (97%)	1
63. Child has trouble with tearing and breaking things	Total	18 (2%)	261 (36%)	444 (61%)	4
	H	18 (4%)	189 (44%)	218 (51%)	3
	NH	0 (0%)	72 (24%)	226 (76%)	1
64. Child has trouble with wetting	Total	32 (4%)	149 (21%)	542 (75%)	4
	H	30 (7%)	93 (22%)	302 (71%)	3
	NH	2 (1%)	56 (19%)	240 (81%)	1

(continued

APPENDIX H-7 (continued

Item		2 Often	1 Once in a while	0 Not at all	Blank
65. Child has trouble with speech	Total	82 (11%)	151 (21%)	490 (68%)	4
	H	70 (16%)	97 (23%)	258 (61%)	3
	NH	12 (4%)	54 (18%)	232 (78%)	1

*Total represents 727 pupils evaluated
H represents 428 pupils rated as having special problems or handicaps
NH represents 299 pupils rated as not having learning problems

APPENDIX H-8

Results of Analyses of Variance for Kindergarten Pupils on Items of the Kindergarten Home Teaching Report

Item	Project Year	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
Conditions affecting visit									
a. Parent ready vs. not ready for visit	First	PCEE	427	4.71	.80	< 1	n.s.	28	7
		Control	180	4.72	.79			14	7
	Second	PCEE	473	4.77	.77	1.47	n.s.	14	3
		Control	136	4.86	.60			3	2
b. Child ready vs. not ready for visit	First	PCEE	383	4.45	1.20	< 1	n.s.	48	13
		Control	161	4.30	1.35			30	18
	Second	PCEE	454	4.81	.66	< 1	n.s.	11	2
		Control	125	4.77	.76			4	3
Parent attitude toward visit									
a. Positive vs. negative	First	PCEE	426	4.74	.56	4.31	<.05	21	5
		Control	183	4.63	.69			18	10
	Second	PCEE	468	4.76	.57	< 1	n.s.	3	1
		Control	135	4.72	.65			3	2
b. Interested vs. disinterested	First	PCEE	423	4.74	.56	1.74	n.s.	39	9
		Control	180	4.67	.68			11	6
	Second	PCEE	468	4.77	.59	< 1	n.s.	5	1
		Control	135	4.73	.65			5	4
c. Self-confident vs. lacking self-confidence	First	PCEE	420	4.55	.76	14.32	<.005	46	11
		Control	179	4.27	.97			37	21
	Second	PCEE	468	4.50	.78	7.02	<.01	10	2
		Control	136	4.29	.97			10	7

(continued)

APPENDIX H-8 (continued)

Item	Project Year	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Parent interaction with child									
a. Accepting vs. rejecting	First	PCEE	393	4.62	.75	< 1	n.s.	38	10
		Control	159	4.60	.76			15	10
	Second	PCEE	462	4.61	.73	< 1	n.s.	6	1
		Control	131	4.59	.78			3	2
b. Aware vs. unaware of needs	First	PCEE	425	4.25	1.02	2.39	n.s.	87	22
		Control	161	4.10	1.09			43	27
	Second	PCEE	462	4.28	.94	3.48	n.s.	23	5
		Control	131	4.11	1.11			12	9
c. Positive vs. negative motivation	First	PCEE	384	4.38	.91	1.56	n.s.	62	16
		Control	157	4.27	.96			32	20
	Second	PCEE	459	4.39	.86	5.60	<.025	15	3
		Control	131	4.18	.98			8	6
d. Positive vs. negative reinforcement	First	PCEE	385	4.33	.96	2.40	n.s.	71	19
		Control	157	4.20	1.10			36	23
	Second	PCEE	458	4.35	.91	5.46	<.025	19	4
		Control	130	4.13	1.03			10	8
e. Competent vs. incompetent	First	PCEE	389	4.38	.88	3.65	n.s.	63	16
		Control	155	4.21	1.04			38	24
	Second	PCEE	463	4.37	.91	4.67	<.05	18	4
		Control	127	4.17	1.01			15	12

(continued)

APPENDIX H-8 (continued)

Item	Project Year	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Deficient N	Deficient %
Parent relationship with teacher									
a. Friendly vs. unfriendly	First	PCEE	426	4.80	.48	<1	n.s.	15	4
		Control	182	4.77	.52			6	4
	Second	PCEE	473	4.78	.60	<1	n.s.	14	3
		Control	136	4.74	.54			6	4
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	First	PCEE	423	4.78	.52	<1	n.s.	18	4
		Control	180	4.74	.55			10	6
	Second	PCEE	473	4.77	.62	<1	n.s.	18	4
		Control	136	4.78	.60			2	1
c. At ease vs. ill at ease	First	PCEE	422	4.64	.70	<1	n.s.	34	9
		Control	180	4.43	.88			27	15
	Second	PCEE	473	4.59	.76	<1	n.s.	5	1
		Control	136	4.53	.85			6	4
Child's relationship with teacher									
a. Outgoing vs. shy	First	PCEE	384	4.36	.97	5.04	<.05	56	15
		Control	160	4.14	1.19			39	24
	Second	PCEE	457	4.30	1.01	<1	n.s.	30	7
		Control	128	4.36	1.07			8	6
b. Cooperative vs. uncooperative	First	PCEE	380	4.54	.79	1.27	n.s.	37	9
		Control	159	4.45	.96			22	14
	Second	PCEE	457	4.64	.72	<1	n.s.	8	2
		Control	127	4.65	.68			11	9
c. Talkative vs. hesitant	First	PCEE	380	4.31	1.00	3.31	n.s.	65	17
		Control	159	4.13	1.16			40	25
	Second	PCEE	457	4.25	1.03	<1	n.s.	31	7
		Control	126	4.32	1.03			8	6

(continued)

APPENDIX H-8 (continued)

Item	Project Year	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	Deficient	
								N	%
Child's response to learning activities									
a. Interested vs. disinterested	First	PCEE	314	4.48	.87	3.61	n.s.	40	12
		Control	120	4.29	1.06			23	19
	Second	PCEE	393	4.68	.66	< 1	n.s.	7	2
		Control	111	4.68	.73			2	2
b. Attentive vs. distracted	First	PCEE	313	4.34	1.00	1.76	n.s.	57	18
		Control	119	4.19	1.16			27	23
	Second	PCEE	392	4.55	.84	< 1	n.s.	16	4
		Control	111	4.47	1.00			8	7
c. Attained all vs. none of objectives	First	PCEE	302	4.35	.86	3.47	n.s.	52	17
		Control	106	4.16	1.00			25	24
	Second	PCEE	388	4.49	.80	< 1	n.s.	10	3
		Control	111	4.42	.86			17	15
Child's attitude toward kindergarten									
a. Positive vs. negative	First	PCEE	428	4.61	.74	< 1	n.s.	37	9
		Control	184	4.58	.73			20	11
	Second	PCEE	463	4.69	.61	< 1	n.s.	27	6
		Control	134	4.68	.64			11	8

APPENDIX I-1

Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of Parents' Performance in Saturday School (N=670)

Item		Ratings				
		Yes	No			
1. On time for planning session	Initial	622 (93%)	48 (7%)			
	Final	623 (93%)	47 (7%)			
		5*	4	3	2	1
2. Willing vs. reluctant to participate	Initial	377 (56%)	118 (18%)	125 (19%)	41 (6%)	9 (1%)
	Final	454 (68%)	133 (20%)	62 (9%)	12 (2%)	9 (1%)
3. Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	223 (33%)	261 (39%)	165 (25%)	19 (3%)	2(<1%)
	Final	375 (56%)	206 (31%)	81 (12%)	8 (1%)	0 (0%)
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	245 (37%)	244 (36%)	150 (22%)	26 (4%)	5 (1%)
	Final	395 (59%)	183 (27%)	78 (12%)	14 (2%)	0 (0%)
5. Accomplished vs. did not accomplish the task assigned	Initial	330 (49%)	208 (31%)	115 (17%)	17 (3%)	0 (0%)
	Final	473 (71%)	140 (21%)	52 (8%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX I-2

Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of a Sample of Parents' Performance in Saturday School (N = 172)

Item		Ratings					
		Yes		No		Blank	
1. On time for planning session	Initial	150 (91%)		14 (9%)		8	
	Final	147 (88%)		20 (12%)		5	
		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
2. Willing vs. reluctant to participate	Initial	117 (71%)	24 (15%)	16 (10%)	6 (4%)	1 (<1%)	8
	Final	106 (63%)	30 (18%)	19 (11%)	7 (4%)	6 (4%)	4
3. Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	80 (50%)	43 (27%)	33 (20%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	11
	Final	101 (60%)	41 (24%)	23 (14%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	4
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	77 (48%)	52 (32%)	25 (16%)	6 (4%)	1 (<1%)	11
	Final	106 (63%)	40 (24%)	20 (12%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	4
5. Accomplished v. did not accomplish the task assigned	Initial	92 (57%)	46 (28%)	18 (11%)	6 (4%)	0 (0%)	10
	Final	111 (66%)	37 (22%)	18 (11%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	4

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX I-3

Initial and Final Teacher Ratings of a Sample of Parents' Performance in Saturday School (N = 180)

Item		Ratings					
		Yes	No				Blank
1. On time for planning session	Initial	146 (93%)	11 (7%)				23
	Final	153 (92%)	13 (8%)				14
		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
2. Willing vs. reluctant to participate	Initial	108 (69%)	31 (20%)	11 (7%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	23
	Final	92 (55%)	37 (22%)	23 (14%)	8 (5%)	6 (4%)	14
3. Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	66 (42%)	64 (41%)	23 (15%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	23
	Final	85 (51%)	48 (29%)	27 (16%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	14
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	69 (44%)	60 (38%)	25 (16%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	23
	Final	81 (49%)	58 (35%)	21 (13%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	14
5. Accomplished vs. did not accomplish task assigned	Initial	77 (49%)	57 (36%)	18 (11%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	23
	Final	95 (57%)	44 (27%)	21 (13%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	14

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point on a five-point scale measuring a presumable continuous dimension with "5" being the positive end of each continuum.

APPENDIX K-1

Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings at Saturday School
and at a Spring Home Visit by Project Director (N=25)

Item		5*	4	3	2	1
1. Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	1 (4%)	13 (52%)	10 (40%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	14 (56%)	8 (32%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2. Aware vs. unaware of children's needs	Initial	0 (0%)	16 (64%)	8 (32%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	11 (44%)	11 (44%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	15 (60%)	9 (36%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
3. Used positive vs. negative motivation	Initial	2 (8%)	16 (64%)	6 (24%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	12 (48%)	12 (48%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	22 (88%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	2 (8%)	15 (60%)	7 (28%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	12 (48%)	12 (48%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	23 (92%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
5. Accomplished 100% vs. 0% of task objectives	Initial	0 (0%)	11 (44%)	13 (52%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	0 (0%)	21 (84%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	6 (24%)	17 (68%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6. Evident vs. not evident respect for parent competencies	Initial	1 (4%)	17 (68%)	6 (24%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	9 (36%)	14 (56%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	19 (76%)	4 (16%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7. Positive vs. negative relationship with parents	Initial	2 (8%)	15 (60%)	8 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Final	15 (60%)	8 (32%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	21 (84%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Continued

APPENDIX **K-1** Continued

Item		5*	4	3	2	1
8. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated appropriate teaching techniques to parents	Initial	2 (8%)	11 (44%)	11 (44%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	11 (44%)	11 (44%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	11 (44%)	12 (48%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
9. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated positive motivation and reinforcement techniques to parents	Initial	2 (8%)	14 (56%)	8 (32%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	Final	12 (48%)	12 (48%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Home Visit	22 (88%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point of a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX K-2

Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings at Saturday School and at Midyear Home Visit by Project Director and Midyear Ratings by Principals (N = 24)

Item		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
1. Used appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	18 (75%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	8 (33%)	10 (42%)	6 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	0 (0%)	13 (54%)	11 (46%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	9 (53%)	6 (35%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7
2. Aware vs. unaware of children's needs	Initial	0 (0%)	6 (25%)	13 (54%)	5 (21%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	1 (4%)	17 (71%)	6 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	4 (17%)	10 (42%)	10 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	11 (65%)	5 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	7
3. Used positive vs. negative motivation	Initial	2 (8%)	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	4 (17%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	18 (75%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	10 (42%)	13 (54%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	7 (44%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	1 (4%)	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	5 (21%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	18 (75%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	11 (46%)	13 (54%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6
5. Accomplished 100% vs. 0% of task objectives	Initial	1 (4%)	7 (29%)	15 (62%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	16 (67%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	8 (33%)	14 (58%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	4 (25%)	10 (62%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8

Continued

APPENDIX K-2 Continued

Item		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
6. Evident vs. not evident respect for parent competence	Initial	3 (12%)	8 (33%)	13 (54%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	9 (38%)	14 (58%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	7 (29%)	12 (50%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	7 (39%)	10 (56%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6
7. Positive vs. negative relationship with parents	Initial	4 (17%)	11 (46%)	8 (33%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	10 (42%)	13 (54%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	12 (50%)	10 (42%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	11 (61%)	7 (39%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6
8. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated appropriate teaching techniques to parents	Initial	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	17 (71%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	7 (29%)	14 (58%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	5 (21%)	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	8 (47%)	7 (41%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	7
9. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated positive motivation and reinforcement techniques to parents	Initial	1 (4%)	6 (25%)	16 (67%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	7 (29%)	17 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	7 (29%)	14 (58%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	7

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point of a five-point scale measuring a presumably continuous dimension.

APPENDIX K-3

Summary of Initial and Final Teacher Ratings at Saturday School and at a Midyear Home Visit by the Project Director and Midyear Ratings by Principals During Third Project Year (N =17)

Item		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
1. Used Appropriate vs. inappropriate teaching techniques	Initial	2 (12%)	7 (41%)	8 (47%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	3 (18%)	9 (53%)	5 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	1 (6%)	12 (71%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
2. Aware vs. unaware of children's needs	Initial	2 (12%)	6 (35%)	8 (47%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	4 (24%)	11 (65%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	5 (29%)	7 (41%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	6 (50%)	6 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
3. Used positive vs. negative motivation	Initial	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	13 (76%)	4 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	6 (46%)	6 (46%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4
4. Used positive vs. negative reinforcement	Initial	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	10 (59%)	6 (35%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
5. Accomplished 100% vs. 0% of task objectives	Initial	7 (41%)	6 (35%)	4 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	6 (35%)	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	7 (41%)	7 (41%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	2 (18%)	8 (73%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6
6. Evident vs. not evident respect for parent competencies	Initial	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	12 (71%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	3 (18%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6

(continued)

APPENDIX K-3 (continued

Item		5*	4	3	2	1	Blank
7. Positive vs. negative relationship with parents	Initial	8 (47%)	9 (53%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	11 (65%)	6 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	9 (53%)	1 (6%)	6 (35%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	8 (67%)	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5
8. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated appropriate teaching techniques to parents	Initial	2 (12%)	13 (76%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	5 (29%)	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	4 (36%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	6
9. Effectively vs. ineffectively demonstrated positive motivation and reinforcement techniques to parents	Initial	2 (12%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Final	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Home Visit	5 (29%)	11 (65%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
	Principals	7 (54%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4

*Numbers above columns each refer to a point of a five-point scale measuring a presumable continuous dimension.

APPENDIX L-1

Frequency Tabulation of Parents' Ratings of Both Pcee Program and Teachers (N = 601)

Item	RATINGS Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Rating Blank
1. The tasks used with my child both at Saturday School and Home Visits were interesting to my child and met his educational needs.	467 (78%)	127 (21%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	0
2. My child's teacher seemed to be very interested in my child as an individual.	534 (89%)	60 (10%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	0
3. The home visit was a good learning experience for both my child and myself.	463 (77%)	127 (21%)	7 (1%)	2 (<1%)	2
4. My lessons were well prepared and explained to me by the teacher when I taught at Saturday School.	476 (82%)	98 (17%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	22
5. As a result of participation in the Home/School Program, I feel better able to deal with my child both educationally and personally.	272 (46%)	290 (49%)	23 (4%)	8 (1%)	8
6. My child's teacher really got me interested in doing more with my child than I had done before.	265 (44%)	278 (47%)	46 (8%)	6 (1%)	6

Continued

APPENDIX L-1 (Continued)

Item	RATINGS Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Rating Blank
7. I felt that my child's teacher liked me both as a parent and as a person.	434 (73%)	153 (26%)	8 (1%)	1 (<1%)	5
8. When my child attends kindergarten, I would like to receive home visits from his kindergarten teacher similar to those home visits received during the Home/School Program year.	262 (44%)	211 (36%)	98 (17%)	20 (3%)	9
9. As a result of my experience in teaching Saturday School, I would like to volunteer for assisting in the kindergarten next year.	197 (36%)	221 (40%)	104 (19%)	30 (5%)	49
10. If I had a three-year-old child, I would like him to have the same teacher as my four-year-old child had this year.	514 (86%)	67 (11%)	15 (3%)	3 (1%)	2

APPENDIX L-2

Frequency Tabulation of Parents' Ratings of Both PCEE Program and Teachers (N = 577)

Item	RATINGS				
	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	Blank
1. The tasks used with my child both at Saturday School and Home Visits were interesting to my child and met his educational needs.	401 (69%)	168 (29%)	7 (1%)	1 (<1%)	0
2. My child's teacher seemed to be very interested in my child as an individual.	483 (84%)	91 (16%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	0
3. The home visit was a good learning experience for both my child and myself	402 (71%)	143 (25%)	19 (3%)	5 (1%)	8
4. My lessons were well prepared and explained to me by the teacher when I taught at Saturday School	465 (83%)	92 (16%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	15
5. As a result of participation in the Home/School Program, I feel better able to deal with my child both educationally and personally.	241 (42%)	300 (53%)	19 (3%)	8 (1%)	9
6. My child's teacher really got me interested in doing more with my child than I had done before.	207 (37%)	294 (52%)	47 (8%)	19 (3%)	10

(continued)

APPENDIX L-2

Item	RATINGS Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	Blank
7. I felt that my child's teacher liked me both as a parent and as a person.	368 (65%)	196 (35%)	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	9
8. When my child attends kindergarten, I would like to receive home visits from his kindergarten teacher similar to those home visits received during the Home/School Program year.	231 (41%)	221 (40%)	78 (14%)	28 (5%)	19
9. As a result of my experience in teaching Saturday School, I would like to volunteer for assisting in the kindergarten next year.	172 (32%)	216 (41%)	107 (20%)	38 (7%)	44
10. If I had a three-year-old child, I would like him to have the same teacher as my four-year-old child had this year.	470 (82%)	85 (15%)	10 (2%)	6 (1%)	6

APPENDIX M-1

Frequency Distributions of Further Diagnostic Screening Test Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Learning Disabled (N=18)

Scores in Months	Beery		Peabody		Oseretsky		Sievers	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
33-34	2							
35-36		1					2	
37-38	1		1				2	
39-40			1	1			1	
41-42								1
43-44			1					
45-46	1		1				2	
47-48			1		1		3	
49-50	3	1			1		1	
51-52	5	1					5	
53-54	2	1	1					
55-56		1	2		2		2	
57-58	1	3		1	2			
59-60	2	2	2		3			
61-62			2		1			
63-64		2						
65-66	1	1	1	1				
67-68		2	3	1	2	2		
69-70			1	3				1
71-72								1
73-74								2
75-76					1	1		1
77-78		1		3		1		3
79-80				1		4		9
81-82				1		1		
83-84						2		
85-86		2		1				
87-88				2				
89-90						1		
91-92				1		1		
93-94			1					
95-96								
97-98				1				
99-100								
101-102				1				

Standard Scores*	Goodenough-Harris	
	Pre	Post
55-56		
57-58	1	
59-60		
61-62		
63-64		
65-66	2	
67-68	1	
69-70	3	1
71-72		
73-74	3	1
75-76	1	
77-78		
79-80		
81-82	2	
83-84		
85-86	2	3
87-88		3
89-90		1
91-92	2	2
93-94		
95-96		
97-98		1
99-100		2
101-102		
103-104		
105-106		
107-108		
109-110		1
111-112		
113-114		
115-116		1
117-118		
119-120		
121 and above		1

* Mean of 100, standard deviation of 15.

APPENDIX M-2

Frequency Distributions of Further Diagnostic Screening Test Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Learning Disabled ($\underline{N}$ = 18)

Scores in Months	Beery Pre	Beery Post	Peabody Pre	Peabody Post	Oseretsky Pre	Oseretsky Post	Sievers Pre	Sievers Post
33-34	1							
35-36	6							
37-38	5							
39-40								
41-42								
43-44			1					
45-46	1						2	
47-48			2				2	
49-50	1	1					1	
51-52	1				1		1	
53-54	2	1	3		1			
55-56		2	2	1	1		1	
57-58	1	4	2	1	3			
59-60		1	1		2			
61-62			1	3	3		1	
63-64		5	2	2		2	1	
65-66		2	1	1	1	1	3	
67-68		1			1	3		
69-70				1	1	5	1	
71-72		1	1			1	3	1
73-74			1	2	1	3		1
75-76			1	3			1	
77-78				1				1

Standard Scores*	Goodenough-Harris Pre	Goodenough-Harris Post
61-62	3	
63-64		
65-66		
67-68		
69-70		
71-72		
73-74	2	
75-76		
77-78	1	1
79-80		2
81-82	1	
83-84	4	
85-86		
87-88		2
89-90	2	4
91-92	1	2
93-94	1	
95-96		2
97-98		1
99-100		
101-102		
103-104		1
105-106		

(continued)

APPENDIX M-2 (continued)

Scores in Months	Beery		Peabody		Oseretsky		Sievers		Standard Scores*	Goodenough-Harris	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
79-80					1		1	15	107-108	1	1
81-82				1					109-110		
83-84									111-112		
85-86									113-114	1	1
87-88				1		1					
89-90											
91-92											
93-94				1							

*Mean of 100, standard deviation of 15.

APPENDIX M-3
Frequency Distributions of Further Diagnostic Screening Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Learning Disabled (N = 25)

ITPA Subtests

Scores in Months	Beery		Auditory Reception		Visual Reception		Auditory Association	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
20 or below								
21-22								
23-24								
25-26					1			
27-28								
29-30								
31-32								
33-34	5							
35-36	2		2				1	
37-38	3	2			1			
39-40			1				1	
41-42			1	1			1	
43-44			1		1		1	2
45-46	1		1		3		2	1
47-48			2	2			5	1
49-50	6	3		2	3			1
51-52	5		6	2	1		2	
53-54		3	3	3			4	2
55-56	1	1	5	6	2	3	1	
57-58	1	2	1		2	1	2	4
59-60		5			1	1		2
61-62				3	1	1	1	3
63-64		7	1				1	4
65-66		2		2	2	1		4
67-68				1	3	3	2	
69-70				1	1	4		
71-72	1							
73-74					1	3		
75-76					1			
77-78						3		
79-80						2		
81-82						1		
83-84								
85-86								
87-88								
89-90								
91 or above				1		1		

(continued)

APPENDIX M-3 (continued)

Scores in Months	Visual Association-tion		Verbal Expression		Motor Expression		Auditory Closure	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
20 or below								
21-22								
23-24			1		1			
25-26					1		1	
27-28	1							
29-30					1			
31-32								
33-34			1				3	
35-36	2							
37-38		1	2					
39-40			1	1			1	
41-42	4				2	1		
43-44	2		6		1		5	1
45-46			2		1		5	2
47-48	2	1	3		3	1		
49-50	1	1					2	1
51-52	3		1					
53-54	3	1		1	3		3	5
55-56	1	3	1				1	3
57-58				2	2	1		4
59-60		3	2	1		2		2
61-62			1	2			1	1
63-64	1	1		3	2	2	1	2
65-66	3	6	2		1	3	1	3
67-68				3				
69-70		4		2	3	1		
71-72		2		3				
73-74						2		
75-76		1	1	4				
77-78					1	1		
79-80								
81-82					1			
83-84								
85-86					1			
87-88								
89-90				1		1		
91 or above	1			1		9		

(continued)

APPENDIX M-3 (continued)

Scores in Months	Visual Closure		Auditory Memory		Visual Memory		Total (PLA)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
20 or below								
21-22								
23-24								
25-26	1		1	1				
27-28								
29-30	1		1					
31-32			2					
33-34			2		1		1	
35-36	1	1	1					
37-38			1	2	2			
39-40	1				2			
41-42	1		6	3			1	
43-44			1	2	3		1	
45-46	3		1	4	2	2	4	
47-48	2	2	1	1			4	1
49-50			4	4	3		1	1
51-52	3	3				3	3	
53-54	2		1				3	
55-56		4		2	2	4	2	3
57-58	2		1	2	2	1	1	2
59-60	2	2						2
61-62					2	1	1	1
63-64	1	1				1	1	3
65-66	1	1	1				1	3
67-68	1	2			1	2		4
69-70		2				3		2
71-72								
73-74	1	1						1
75-76		1						1
77-78		2		1	1	2		
79-80								
81-82					2	2		
83-84								
85-86				1				
87-88						2		
89-90	1							
91 or above		2		1	1	1		

(continued)

APPENDIX M-3 (continued

	Goodenough-Harris	
Standard Scores	Pre	Post
55-56	3	
57-58		
59-60	1	1
61-62	1	
63-64		
65-66		
67-68		
69-70	1	1
71-72		
73-74	4	
75-76	1	
77-78	4	2
79-80		2
81-82	1	4
83-84	1	2
85-86		1
87-88	1	2
89-90	1	3
91-92	3	2
93-94		
95-96	2	
97-98		1
99-100		
101-102		
103-104		
105-106		
107-108		1
109-110		1
111-112		1

APPENDIX N-1a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment For All Pupils (N=798), Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N=289), Pupils Identified as Having No Handicaps (N=417), and All Pupils Identified as Having Special Problems or Handicaps (N=381)

1. Relationships with Peers

	1 Poor	2	3 Fair	4	5 Good	Blank (No Rating)
*ED	24 (8%)	53 (18%)	100 (35%)	38 (30%)	23 (8%)	1
NH	4 (1%)	9 (2%)	96 (23%)	217 (53%)	85 (21%)	6
H	29 (8%)	69 (18%)	123 (32%)	125 (33%)	34 (9%)	1
Total	33 (4%)	78 (10%)	219 (28%)	342 (43%)	119 (15%)	7

2. Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

	1 Poor	2	3 Fair	4	5 Good	
ED	24 (8%)	40 (14%)	90 (31%)	103 (36%)	31 (11%)	1
NH	3 (1%)	12 (3%)	84 (20%)	201 (49%)	111 (27%)	6
H	24 (6%)	47 (12%)	123 (32%)	144 (38%)	42 (11%)	1
Total	27 (3%)	59 (7%)	207 (26%)	345 (44%)	153 (19%)	7

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1 Poor	2	3 Fair	4	5 Good	
ED	13 (4%)	31 (11%)	106 (37%)	95 (33%)	43 (15%)	1
NH	1 (<1%)	5 (1%)	92 (22%)	212 (52%)	101 (25%)	6
H	15 (4%)	43 (11%)	138 (36%)	132 (35%)	52 (14%)	1
Total	16 (2%)	48 (6%)	230 (29%)	344 (43%)	153 (19%)	7

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1 Many	2	3 Few	4	5 None	
ED	18 (6%)	38 (13%)	83 (29%)	103 (36%)	46 (16%)	1
NH	1 (<1%)	10 (2%)	65 (16%)	178 (43%)	157 (38%)	6
H	21 (6%)	50 (13%)	104 (27%)	145 (38%)	60 (16%)	1
Total	22 (3%)	60 (8%)	169 (21%)	323 (41%)	217 (27%)	7

APPENDIX N-1a (Contd.)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5	Blank (No Rating)
	Many		Few		None	
ED	13 (4%)	33 (11%)	80 (28%)	95 (33%)	68 (24%)	0
NH	0 (0%)	6 (1%)	52 (13%)	180 (44%)	173 (42%)	6
H	14 (4%)	42 (11%)	101 (27%)	138 (36%)	86 (23%)	0
Total	14 (2%)	48 (6%)	153 (19%)	318 (40%)	259 (33%)	6

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Gross		Minor		None	
ED	4 (1%)	11 (4%)	53 (18%)	72 (25%)	149 (52%)	0
NH	5 (1%)	6 (1%)	37 (9%)	87 (21%)	276 (67%)	6
H	6 (2%)	15 (4%)	63 (17%)	98 (26%)	198 (52%)	1
Total	11 (1%)	21 (3%)	100 (13%)	185 (23%)	474 (60%)	7

7. Pathological Family Relationships

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Gross		Minor		None	
ED	4 (1%)	19 (7%)	48 (17%)	69 (24%)	149 (52%)	0
NH	2 (<1%)	6 (1%)	14 (3%)	71 (17%)	318 (78%)	6
H	4 (1%)	22 (6%)	57 (15%)	92 (24%)	206 (54%)	0
Total	6 (1%)	28 (4%)	71 (9%)	163 (21%)	524 (66%)	6

Total Adjustment Score

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High	
ED	14 (5%)	21 (7%)	57 (20%)	196 (68%	1
NH	1 (<1%)	5 (1%)	9 (2%)	396 (96%)	6
H	15 (4%)	25 (7%)	70 (18%)	270 (71%)	1
Total	16 (2%)	30 (4%)	79 (10%)	666 (84%)	7

* Total represents 798 pupils evaluated
ED represents 289 pupils rated as having emotional disturbances
NH represents 417 pupils rated as having no handicap
H represents 381 pupils rated as having special problems or handicaps

APPENDIX N-1b

Final Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment for All Pupils (N=797), Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N=243), Pupils Identified as Having No Handicaps (N=450), and all Pupils Identified as Having Special Problems or Handicaps (N=347)

1. Relationship with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5	Blank (No rtg.)
	Poor		Fair		Good	
*ED	12 (5%)	24 (10%)	71 (29%)	69 (29%)	66 (27%)	1
NH	1 (<1%)	23 (6%)	53 (13%)	140 (34%)	195 (47%)	38
H	16 (5%)	32 (9%)	99 (29%)	96 (28%)	102 (30%)	2
Total	17 (2%)	55 (7%)	152 (20%)	236 (31%)	297 (39%)	40

2. Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Poor		Fair		Good	
ED	2 (1%)	28 (12%)	68 (28%)	83 (34%)	61 (25%)	1
NH	3 (1%)	12 (3%)	73 (18%)	133 (32%)	191 (46%)	38
H	3 (1%)	38 (11%)	92 (27%)	116 (34%)	96 (28%)	2
Total	6 (1%)	50 (7%)	165 (22%)	249 (33%)	287 (38%)	40

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Poor		Fair		Good	
ED	1 (<1%)	8 (3%)	59 (24%)	75 (31%)	99 (41%)	1
NH	1 (<1%)	4 (1%)	46 (11%)	143 (35%)	218 (53%)	38
H	2 (1%)	12 (3%)	80 (23%)	113 (33%)	138 (40%)	2
Total	3 (<1%)	16 (2%)	126 (17%)	256 (34%)	356 (47%)	40

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Many		Few		None	
ED	2 (1%)	14 (6%)	63 (26%)	89 (37%)	74 (31%)	1
NH	2 (<1%)	10 (2%)	47 (11%)	163 (40%)	190 (46%)	38
H	2 (1%)	23 (7%)	88 (25%)	130 (38%)	102 (30%)	2
Total	4 (1%)	33 (4%)	135 (18%)	293 (39%)	292 (39%)	40

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Many		Few		None	
ED	5 (2%)	23 (10%)	56 (23%)	89 (37%)	69 (29%)	1
NH	4 (1%)	13 (3%)	51 (12%)	161 (39%)	183 (44%)	38
H	6 (2%)	29 (8%)	85 (25%)	123 (36%)	102 (30%)	2
Total	10 (1%)	42 (6%)	136 (18%)	284 (38%)	285 (38%)	40

Continued

APPENDIX **N-1b (Contd.)**

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5	Blank (No rtg.
	Gross		Minor		None	
ED	7 (3%)	12 (5%)	35 (14%)	59 (24%)	129 (53%)	1
NH	1 (<1%)	12 (3%)	31 (8%)	96 (23%)	272 (66%)	38
H	8 (2%)	16 (5%)	46 (13%)	92 (27%)	183 (53%)	2
Total	9 (1%)	28 (4%)	77 (10%)	188 (25%)	455 (60%)	40

7. Pathological Family Relationships

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Gross		Minor		None	
ED	4 (2%)	12 (5%)	37 (15%)	66 (27%)	123 (51%)	1
NH	5 (1%)	13 (3%)	27 (7%)	67 (16%)	300 (73%)	38
H	5 (1%)	14 (4%)	55 (16%)	89 (26%)	182 (53%)	2
Total	10 (1%)	27 (4%)	82 (11%)	156 (21%)	482 (64%)	40

Total Adjustment Score

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High	
ED	4 (2%)	3 (1%)	37 (15%)	198 (82%)	1
NH	3 (1%)	5 (1%)	17 (4%)	387 (94%)	38
H	7 (2%)	5 (1%)	45 (13%)	288 (83%)	2
Total	10 (1%)	10 (1%)	62 (8%)	675 (89%)	40

---

* Total represents 797 pupils evaluated
ED represents 243 pupils identified as having emotional disturbances
NH represents 450 pupils identified as having no handicap
H represents 347 pupils identified as having special problems or handicaps

APPENDIX N-1c

Kindergarten Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment For All PCEE Pupils (N = 617), PCEE Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 239), and PCEE Pupils Identified as not Having Emotional Problems (N = 378)

1. Relationships with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total*	9 (1%)	29 (5%)	115 (19%)	249 (40%)	215 (35%)
ED	6 (3%)	13 (5%)	55 (23%)	99 (41%)	66 (28%)
Not ED	3 (1%)	16 (4%)	60 (16%)	150 (40%)	149 (39%)

2. Relationships With Kindergarten School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total	11 (2%)	24 (4%)	126 (20%)	211 (34%)	245 (40%)
ED	8 (3%)	12 (5%)	67 (28%)	84 (35%)	68 (28%)
Not ED	3 (1%)	12 (3%)	59 (16%)	127 (34%)	177 (47%)

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total	12 (2%)	24 (4%)	133 (22%)	267 (43%)	182 (29%)
ED	5 (2%)	9 (4%)	58 (24%)	100 (42%)	67 (28%)
Not ED	7 (2%)	15 (4%)	75 (20%)	167 (44%)	115 (30%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
Total	6 (1%)	45 (7%)	78 (13%)	207 (34%)	281 (46%)
ED	4 (2%)	27 (11%)	40 (17%)	81 (34%)	87 (36%)
Not ED	2 (1%)	18 (5%)	38 (10%)	126 (33%)	194 (51%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
Total	11 (2%)	37 (6%)	87 (14%)	208 (34%)	275 (45%)
ED	4 (2%)	20 (8%)	51 (21%)	77 (32%)	87 (36%)
Not ED	7 (2%)	17 (4%)	36 (10%)	131 (35%)	188 (50%)

*Total represents 617 pupils evaluated
ED represents 239 pupils identified as having emotional problems
Not ED represents 378 pupils identified as not having emotional problems.

APPENDIX N-2a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" During the Fall, 1972

1. Relationships with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED*	18 (8%)	40 (19%)	72 (34%)	52 (24%)	32 (15%)
NED	6 (1%)	23 (5%)	139 (33%)	155 (36%)	104 (24%)
Total	25 (4%)	63 (10%)	215 (33%)	207 (32%)	140 (22%)

2. Relationships With Nursery School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	17 (8%)	42 (20%)	62 (29%)	48 (22%)	45 (21%)
NED	3 (1%)	24 (6%)	116 (27%)	177 (41%)	107 (25%)
Total	20 (3%)	67 (10%)	182 (28%)	226 (35%)	155 (24%)

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	9 (4%)	21 (10%)	88 (41%)	52 (24%)	44 (21%)
NED	1 (<1%)	14 (3%)	122 (29%)	154 (36%)	136 (32%)
Total	10 (2%)	35 (5%)	212 (33%)	207 (32%)	186 (29%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	12 (6%)	50 (23%)	62 (29%)	52 (24%)	38 (18%)
NED	5 (1%)	36 (8%)	108 (25%)	150 (35%)	128 (30%)
Total	17 (3%)	88 (14%)	171 (26%)	206 (32%)	168 (26%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	15 (7%)	50 (23%)	58 (27%)	44 (21%)	47 (22%)
NED	4 (1%)	37 (9%)	88 (21%)	148 (35%)	150 (35%)
Total	19 (3%)	88 (14%)	148 (23%)	194 (30%)	201 (31%)

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	7 (3%)	18 (8%)	25 (12%)	65 (30%)	99 (46%)
NED	7 (2%)	11 (3%)	31 (7%)	102 (24%)	276 (65%)
Total	14 (2%)	29 (4%)	58 (9%)	167 (26%)	382 (59%)

(continued)

APPENDIX N-2a (continued)

7. Pathological Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	5 (2%)	21 (10%)	32 (15%)	52 (24%)	104 (49%)
NED	1 (<1%)	7 (2%)	35 (8%)	75 (18%)	309 (72%)
Total	6 (1%)	28 (4%)	68 (10%)	129 (20%)	419 (64%)

Total Adjustment Score

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High
ED	21 (10%)	19 (9%)	39 (18%)	135 (63%)
NED	1 (<1%)	7 (2%)	41 (10%)	378 (89%)
Total	22 (3%)	27 (4%)	80 (12%)	521 (80%)

---

*Total represents 650 pupils evaluated twice.
ED represents 214 pupils identified as having emotional problems.
NED represents 427 pupils identified as having no emotional problems.

APPENDIX N-2b

Final Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" During the Spring, 1973

1. Relationships with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED*	4 (2%)	20 (9%)	55 (26%)	73 (34%)	62 (29%)
NED	3 (1%)	12 (3%)	78 (18%)	157 (37%)	177 (41%)
Total	9 (1%)	32 (5%)	133 (20%)	233 (36%)	243 (37%)

2. Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	3 (1%)	16 (7%)	50 (23%)	77 (36%)	68 (32%)
NED	3 (1%)	14 (3%)	78 (18%)	136 (32%)	196 (46%)
Total	7 (1%)	31 (5%)	129 (20%)	216 (33%)	267 (41%)

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	4 (2%)	8 (4%)	70 (33%)	58 (27%)	74 (35%)
NED	4 (1%)	9 (2%)	75 (18%)	128 (30%)	211 (49%)
Total	9 (1%)	18 (3%)	145 (22%)	188 (29%)	290 (45%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	7 (3%)	23 (11%)	51 (24%)	71 (33%)	62 (29%)
NED	5 (1%)	18 (4%)	75 (18%)	157 (37%)	172 (40%)
Total	12 (2%)	43 (7%)	127 (20%)	232 (36%)	236 (36%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	4 (2%)	30 (14%)	49 (23%)	83 (39%)	48 (22%)
NED	4 (1%)	23 (5%)	79 (19%)	156 (37%)	165 (39%)
Total	9 (1%)	53 (8%)	131 (20%)	240 (37%)	217 (33%)

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	6 (3%)	13 (6%)	18 (8%)	47 (22%)	130 (61%)
NED	2 (<1%)	12 (3%)	50 (12%)	80 (19%)	283 (66%)
Total	8 (1%)	25 (4%)	70 (11%)	128 (20%)	419 (64%)

(continued)

7. Pathological Family Structure

	1 Gross	2	3 Minor	4	5 None
ED	4 (2%)	9 (4%)	18 (8%)	51 (24%)	132 (62%)
NED	2 (<1%)	10 (2%)	37 (9%)	58 (14%)	320 (75%)
Total	6 (1%)	19 (3%)	58 (9%)	111 (17%)	456 (70%)

Total Adjustment Score

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High
ED	5 (2%)	9 (4%)	20 (10%)	180 (84%)
NED	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	31 (7%)	388 (91%)
Total	10 (2%)	15 (2%)	49 (8%)	576 (89%)

---

*Total represents 650 pupils evaluated twice.
ED represents 214 pupils identified as having emotional problems.
NED represents 427 pupils identified as having no emotional problems.

APPENDIX N-2c

Kindergarten Teacher Ratings of Pupils' Adjustment in Fall, 1973 For All PCEE Pupils (N = 576), PCEE Pupils Identified as Having Emotional Problems (N = 183), and PCEE Pupils Identified as Not Having Emotional Problems (N = 393)

1. Relationships with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total	14 (2%)	34 (6%)	135 (23%)	231 (40%)	162 (28%)
ED	5 (3%)	12 (7%)	47 (26%)	67 (37%)	52 (28%)
Not ED	9 (2%)	22 (6%)	88 (22%)	164 (42%)	110 (28%)

2. Relationships with Kindergarten School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total	12 (2%)	23 (4%)	126 (22%)	231 (40%)	184 (32%)
ED	5 (3%)	9 (5%)	39 (21%)	67 (37%)	63 (34%)
Not ED	7 (2%)	14 (4%)	87 (22%)	164 (42%)	121 (31%)

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
Total	23 (4%)	24 (4%)	168 (29%)	209 (36%)	152 (26%)
ED	13 (7%)	8 (4%)	50 (27%)	67 (37%)	45 (25%)
Not ED	10 (3%)	16 (4%)	118 (30%)	142 (36%)	107 (27%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	None		Few		Many
Total	259 (45%)	198 (34%)	77 (13%)	28 (5%)	14 (2%)
ED	76 (42%)	64 (35%)	28 (15%)	9 (5%)	6 (3%)
Not ED	183 (47%)	134 (34%)	49 (12%)	19 (5%)	8 (2%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	None		Few		Many
Total	269 (47%)	180 (31%)	82 (14%)	26 (5%)	19 (3%)
ED	68 (37%)	64 (35%)	33 (18%)	11 (6%)	7 (4%)
Not ED	201 (51%)	116 (30%)	49 (12%)	15 (4%)	12 (3%)

APPENDIX N-3a

Initial Teacher Ratings of Third Year Pupils' Adjustment on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" During the Fall, 1973

1. Relationships with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED*	27 (12%)	51 (22%)	108 (46%)	40 (17%)	7 (3%)
NED	3 (1%)	40 (9%)	202 (45%)	159 (35%)	48 (11%)
Total	30 (4%)	91 (13%)	310 (45%)	199 (29%)	55 (8%)

2. Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	15 (6%)	64 (28%)	95 (41%)	50 (22%)	9 (4%)
NED	0 (0%)	38 (8%)	183 (40%)	165 (37%)	66 (15%)
Total	15 (2%)	102 (15%)	278 (41%)	215 (31%)	75 (11%)

3. Creative Use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	9 (4%)	33 (14%)	109 (47%)	66 (28%)	16 (7%)
NED	3 (1%)	14 (3%)	179 (40%)	190 (42%)	66 (15%)
Total	12 (2%)	47 (7%)	288 (42%)	256 (37%)	82 (12%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	22 (9%)	48 (21%)	94 (40%)	44 (19%)	25 (11%)
NED	2 (<1%)	40 (9%)	172 (38%)	133 (29%)	105 (23%)
Total	24 (4%)	88 (13%)	266 (39%)	177 (26%)	130 (19%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	11 (5%)	63 (27%)	82 (35%)	39 (17%)	38 (16%)
NED	2 (<1%)	31 (7%)	167 (37%)	109 (24%)	143 (32%)
Total	13 (2%)	94 (14%)	249 (36%)	148 (22%)	181 (26%)

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	10 (4%)	18 (8%)	49 (21%)	67 (29%)	89 (38%)
NED	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	49 (11%)	134 (30%)	263 (58%)
Total	13 (2%)	21 (3%)	98 (14%)	201 (29%)	352 (51%)

(continued)

APPENDIX N-3a (continued)

7. Pathological Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	5 (2%)	23 (10%)	46 (20%)	52 (22%)	107 (46%)
NED	2 (<1%)	7 (2%)	28 (6%)	94 (21%)	321 (71%)
Total	7 (1%)	30 (4%)	74 (11%)	146 (21%)	428 (63%)

Total Adjustment Score

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High
ED	18 (8%)	36 (15%)	58 (25%)	121 (52%)
NED	2 (<1%)	0 (0%)	56 (12%)	394 (87%)
Total	20 (3%)	36 (5%)	114 (17%)	515 (75%)

*Total represents 685 pupils evaluated twice.
ED = 233 pupils identified as having emotional problems who were rated twice.
NED = 452 pupils identified as not having emotional problems who were rated twice.

APPENDIX N-3b

Final Teacher Ratings of Third Year Pupils' Adjustment on Items of the "Nursery School Adjustment Scale" During Spring, 1974

1. Relationship with Peers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED*	13 (6%)	33 (14%)	95 (41%)	63 (27%)	29 (12%)
NED	3 (1%)	39 (9%)	149 (33%)	156 (35%)	105 (23%)
Total	16 (2%)	72 (11%)	244 (36%)	219 (32%)	134 (20%)

2. Relationships with Nursery School Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	7 (3%)	40 (17%)	98 (42%)	58 (25%)	30 (13%)
NED	2 (<1%)	27 (6%)	149 (33%)	163 (36%)	111 (25%)
Total	9 (1%)	67 (10%)	247 (36%)	221 (32%)	141 (21%)

3. Creative use of Individual Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor		Fair		Good
ED	3 (1%)	16 (7%)	83 (36%)	101 (43%)	30 (13%)
NED	1 (<1%)	18 (4%)	122 (27%)	212 (47%)	99 (22%)
Total	4 (1%)	34 (5%)	205 (30%)	313 (46%)	129 (19%)

4. Signs of Behavioral Immaturity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	8 (3%)	25 (11%)	87 (37%)	80 (34%)	33 (14%)
NED	0 (0%)	28 (6%)	142 (31%)	183 (40%)	99 (22%)
Total	8 (1%)	53 (8%)	229 (33%)	263 (38%)	132 (19%)

5. Signs of Behavioral Eccentricity

	1	2	3	4	5
	Many		Few		None
ED	5 (2%)	27 (12%)	95 (41%)	78 (34%)	28 (12%)
NED	1 (<1%)	23 (5%)	125 (28%)	179 (40%)	124 (27%)
Total	6 (1%)	50 (7%)	220 (32%)	257 (38%)	152 (22%)

6. Deviance in Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	2 (1%)	16 (7%)	50 (22%)	62 (27%)	103 (44%)
NED	3 (1%)	10 (2%)	42 (9%)	109 (24%)	288 (64%)
Total	5 (1%)	26 (4%)	92 (13%)	171 (25%)	391 (57%)

(continued)

APPENDIX N-3b (continued

7. Pathological Family Structure

	1	2	3	4	5
	Gross		Minor		None
ED	5 (2%)	6 (2%)	48 (21%)	53 (23%)	121 (52%)
NED	4 (1%)	3 (1%)	44 (10%)	69 (15%)	332 (73%)
Total	9 (1%)	9 (1%)	92 (13%)	122 (18%)	453 (66%)

Total Adjustment Scores

	Low	Low Medium	High Medium	High
ED	10 (4%)	6 (3%)	49 (21%)	168 (72%)
NED	1 (<1%)	8 (2%)	36 (8%)	407 (90%)
Total	11 (2%)	14 (2%)	85 (12%)	575 (84%)

*Total represents 685 pupils evaluated twice.
ED = 233 pupils identified as having emotional problems who were rated twice.
NED = 452 pupils identified as not having emotional problems who were rated twice.

APPENDIX O-1

Frequency Distributions of Further Screening Test Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Mentally Retarded (N=8)

Scores in Months	Stanford-Binet		Vineland Social Maturity	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
31-32	1			
33-34				
35-36				
37-38				
39-40	1			
41-42	2		2	
43-44	2			
45-46	2			1
47-48		1	1	
49-50				
51-52		2	1	
53-54		1	1	
55-56		3		
57-58			1	2
59-60		1		1
61-62			1	
63-64				1
65-66				
67-68				1
69-70				1

APPENDIX O-2

Frequency Distributions of Further Screening Battery and Follow Up Administered to Pupils Identified as Mentally Retarded (N = 15)*

Scores in Months	TESTS			
	Stanford-Binet		Vineland Social Maturity	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
23-24			1	
25-26				
27-28				
29-30				
31-32				
33-34				1
35-36			1	
37-38				
39-40	1			
41-42			1	
43-44	1			
45-46				
47-48	1		3	
49-50	3		1	
51-52	1	1	1	
53-54	1			
55-56	1	3	4	1
57-58	3	3		
59-60		1		
61-62	1	1	1	
63-64	1	1		1
65-66		1		2
67-68				4
69-70		2		2
71-72			1	2
73-74		1		
75-76			1	
77-78				2

*One child was considered untestable with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test

APPENDIX O-3

Frequency Distribution of Further Screening Battery and Follow Up Administered to Third Project Year Pupils Identified as Mentally Retarded (N = 13)*

	TESTS			
	Stanford-Binet		Vineland Social Maturity	
Scores in Months	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
25-26	1		1	1
27-28				
29-30	1			
31-32	1	1	1	1
33-34				
35-36				
37-38		1	1	
39-40				
41-42	2			
43-44	1	1		
45-46	1	1		
47-48	1			
49-50	1		1	
51-52	2		2	
53-54		2		3
55-56	1		3	
57-58		3	1	1
59-60		1		
61-62			1	
63-64				
65-66		1		
67-68		1	1	3
69-70				
71-72				
73-74				1
75-76				1
77-78				1
79-80				
81 or more			1	1

*One child was considered untestable with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test

APPENDIX P

Final Report

(1973 - 1974 School Year)

PARENT-CHILD EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM
Ferguson-Florissant School District

COMPONENT FOR THE EMOTIONALLY HANDICAPPED

Submitted by:

Sidney Kasper, Ph.D.

In this third year of our participation in the Parent-Child Early Education Program our aim was to provide the same basic consultative and service features of previous years while attempting a number of innovations which might contribute even more to our total impact upon the target population. Again, we devoted our efforts to three major areas of service:

I. Screening and diagnosis.
II. Counseling and consultation to parents.
III. Consultation and in-service training to teachers.

Our primary innovations occured in our screening procedures and in an extension of the services available to parents. As regards screening, we introduced a scheme for further refinements in determining the psychological development or readiness of the child. With regard to parents, our traditional availability for counseling and consultation was expanded to include two separate series of dialogues in which the three members of our staff met as a team with groups of parents who showed an interest in an ongoing discussion pertaining to "How Does Your Family Grow?" Each of these added elements in our program will be expanded upon in the sections of this report which follow.

I. Diagnostic Screening

The basic approach to screening remained much the same as the approach utilized in the two previous years. All of the 728 children enrolled in Saturday School were screened in two separate stages, (1) the initial screening battery at the outset of the school year and (2) teacher judgments on The Nursery School Adjustment Scale during November, 1973. The initial screening battery contained a variety of test findings, teacher observations and parent reports. The Nursery School Adjustment Scale, on the other hand, required the teacher to judge each child with regard to the child's actual behavior and home-life circumstances as observed by the teacher to that point.

The data derived through use of the initial screening battery was viewed with regard to developmental progress to age 4. Our task was to take note of those children whose developmental progress seemed sufficiently deviant that we might intervene on their behalf at the earliest possible moment, either by way of program development or special services to the child's family. These children were not necessarily regarded as emotionally disturbed, though many of the identifiable problems were regarded as indicators of significant psychological dysfunction. In a substantial number of cases the degree of parental concern was the crucial element which led us to designate the child as deserving of further observation by our staff. While there was a decided need to detect the children who were most at risk, we never intended that these children be labelled as "emotionally disturbed." We have frequently taken the opportunity to explain to teachers that it was not our intent to offer these screenings as definitive, nor was there a sound basis for regarding these children as disturbed.

This year, in an effort to apply more rigorous controls to the selection process, we introduced a rating scheme tied to an assessment of ego development, particularly the concepts of trust, self-control, initiative, independence and self-esteem. It meant that the somewhat arduous process of reviewing each child's record was now combined with a more systematic procedure which would enable us to categorize the deviant children as mild, moderate or severe. It also enabled us to identify some of the more salient atypicalities within the child or within the parent-child relationship.

The total number of children with significant developmental deviations numbered 194, or approximately 27% of the total population. These figures are very similar to that which has prevailed in each of the two previous years. The most frequently noted behavioral or symptom clusters found among children with significant developmental deficits are summarized as follows:

(1) Infantile or grossly immature.
(2) Insufficient self-control.
(3) Unusual anxiety or fearfulness.

As regards severity of symptomatology, the cases were allocated into one of three categories: (1) mild, (2) moderate, or (3) severe. These judgments were determined on the basis of reported symptoms and their frequency, anecdotal remarks of teachers who administered the screening devices, and such additional information as may have been volunteered by the parent. Of the 194 deviant cases, their distribution was as follows:

Rating	N	% of E.H. Total
Mild	133	69
Moderate	51	26
Severe	10	5

This group of 194 cases was expanded by the addition of 56 cases identified by teachers through use of the Nursery School Adjustment Scale. These were children who apparently escaped earlier detection by way of screening but whose total score on the Adjustment Scale was less than 21. This cutting score is identical to the cutting score used in differentiating last year's school population, but it was selected on the basis of its efficacy with the current population as well as its conformity to the general rationale that a mid-point score on each of the seven dimensions which comprise the total Scale is equal to 21.

Of the 97 cases with significantly low scores on the Adjustment Scale, 42% had also been identified by way of the initial screening battery. This finding is very similar to the results reported in last year's summary. Again, as was the situation last year, the majority of the 56 cases added to our E.H. roster contained elements in their record which suggested that learning disabilities or suspected mental retardation were complicating factors which resulted in their earlier omission from our E.H. group.

II. Counseling and Consultation to Parents

A. Services Available to All Parents

We have consistently held to the basic tenet that we can be of greatest value to parents by espousing sound child development principles, particularly within a context which permitted fairly easy access to the child development consultant. Toward this end we have taken it upon ourselves to facilitate our ready identification as helping persons who are visibly involved in the week-to-week workings of the program. We have become familiar figures to parents who visited or participated in the regular Saturday sessions, but we have also created a number of opportunities for all parents to meet with us in relation to their interests or concerns.

In some instances, we have initiated periodic presentations during evening hours when both mothers and fathers might attend. One such series of presentations, during the Autumn months found us at various sites, talking about the general concept of "Growing Up O.K." These sessions attracted approximately 150 parents, most of whom were meaningfully engaged in general discussion. A number of these parents then requested individual sessions with the consultant so that certain issues could be explored more fully.

A similar theme, with a very different format, was the vehicle for still other discussions with parents who were interested in attending a session which was again open to all parents of children in Saturday School. "How Does Your Family Grow?" was the theme around which we organized a series of Saturday sessions at each school site during January and February of 1974. These sessions were aimed at informality and a dialogue among parents and consultants, except that our staff participated as a unit in each session rather than asking that specific staff members assume total responsibility for meetings at specific sites (the approach utilized earlier).

The dialogues were enormously successful in generating a surprisingly free exchange among parents which was characterized by considerable self-disclosure, mutual support and an effort to search for new ideas or potential "solutions" to problems, both general and specific. For the most part, parents focussed upon their experiences with their four-year-old, but there were many instances in which other family members were under discussion.

Some of the more commonly discussed issues were shyness, jealousy, aggression or temper tantrums, dependency and bedwetting. While these behavioral patterns were part of each session, there were also presentations of broader issues which permitted or stimulated discussion of family interrelationships and processes as well as behavioral symptoms in a specific child. To illustrate, one mother who remained relatively silent for approximately 30 minutes, listening to the other parents , eventually took the opportunity to talk about her little "Queen of Sheba." She was describing her four-year-old, the youngest of several children, and her mixed feelings regarding this child. She was delighted with the child in almost every respect, recognizing that the child had been catered to by the entire family, but she wondered if they had created a situation which would make it exceedingly difficult for this child "once she got into the real world." There, she might find that others view her as less than special.

Interestingly, as the discussion evolved, it became increasingly apparent that this mother was strugging with her own feelings of giving up the child (to a school situation), feeling that this was her baby and that she would have no additional children to "mother" in this way. By session's end, she announced she knew the answer to her question, that she recognized the need to further explore her own feelings with the aim of finding the ways in which she could more freely permit her daughter to separate from her. We later heard that she had taken the initiative to attend several sessions on Parent Effectiveness Training, held at the school, and that she had brought her husband as well.

These dialogues were so well received that we arranged for still another series in late March and early April. As an afterthought, it was later suggested that we attempt to survey parents as to their reactions to these dialogues. While our records indicate that these sessions were attended by approximately 150 parents, we were able to retrieve only the names of approximately one-third of the group. Writing to these parents and asking that they anonymously share their reactions with us brought a response from 19 families. The results of this survey may be found in Table 1 while a sample of the survey form may be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 1
PARENT SURVEY

	Strongly Negative (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly Positive (5)
Discussions helpful.	1	0	6	6	6
Opportunity to talk about own interests.	0	1	5	2	11
Reassured about own childrearing practices.	0	1	3	6	9
Did sharing ideas with others help.	1	2	2	7	7
New ideas.	1	5	4	5	4
More meetings.	2	2	2	0	13

N=19

Although the sample is so small as to render the results as merely suggestive of parental reactions, it is clear that those who took the time to respond were generally of firm conviction and overwhelmingly positive in their evaluation. For example, sixty-eight percent would endorse the notion of future such meetings without reservations. By and large, these results confirm the impressions derived by our staff in their later contacts with parents and other occasional participants, e.g., the project director or a psychologist affiliated with another component of the Saturday School program.

B. Services to Parents With Special Needs

Consistent with the philosophy which we have evolved over the past three years, direct consultation services to parents has been offered under either of two conditions: (1) the staff's concern regarding a child or parent or (2) the outright request for such services on the part of a parent.

As regards the first of these two conditions, the decisive factor in reaching out to a parent has been the extent to which it was felt that the basic Saturday School program was sufficient to meet existing needs. For example, many initially anxious parents were effectively maintained by the teacher through home visits without subsequent referral to the consultant. This was a well-monitored process which was maintained through regular contacts with the teacher. The initial efforts were aimed at meeting the needs of the parent or child through the teacher, utilizing all of the available services of the basic program. Occasionally, where this approach did not suffice, or where it called for clinical skills unavailable to the teacher, referral to the consultant was initiated through the teacher. Of course, as implied under condition (2), no parent was ever denied an opportunity for consultation, however indirect or tentative the request. In virtually every instance, as detailed in previous annual reports, our experience has shown that referral is best facilitated through the already established parent-teacher relationship.

In all, the parents of 88 children were seen in individual sessions on one or more occasions. A list of these parents and their distribution by schools may be found in Table 2. These figures are very much in keeping with the activities of our staff as reported in previous years. Last year, for example, we reported individual contacts with parents of 97 school children, a figure which reflected an increase in individual sessions over the previous year, though we had also discontinued our efforts at group sessions (see report for '72-'73 school year for details).

APPENDIX P (continued) Pages 7 and 8

TABLE II

Children Whose Parents Were Seen in Interview

Bermuda School	006 017 025
Central School	011 016 021 023 032
Combs School	008 013
Commons Lane School	002 007 027
Cool Valley School	003 007 014 019 021 024
DeSmet School	008 012 024 029 035 051
Duchesne School	029 030 036 037 045
Graham School	007 015 021 027
Griffith School	015 018 020 032 037 038 049
Halls Ferry School	003 014 021 043
Lee Hamilton School	008 013 027
Mark Twain School	019 021 023 026 035 043
Parker Road School	001 003 008 026 029 037
Robinwood School	003 004 005 032 036 053
Vogt School	002 003 016
Walnut Grove School	011 015 016 017 025 036 038 045 048
Wedgwood School	004 010 013 020 036 048 053 069

This year, with somewhat more ample funding and a somewhat restructured program, we were again able to reach out to all parents. Accordingly, any comparison of number of parents seen should take these factors into account. To illustrate, if we combine number of parents seen in individual sessions with those parents seen in our dialogues or other open sessions we would slightly exceed the number of parents seen in individual and group sessions during the '71-'72 school year.

Virtually all of these parents were highly receptive to the notion of referral and, somewhat in relation to the procedure already described, many of the parents were highly motivated for seeking change. As might be expected, some parents were initially apprehensive about contact with the consultant, but the guarded, defensive reactions which sometimes occurred were encountered in approximately ten percent of the group. Similarly, we again encountered an exceedingly small group of resistive parents (estimated at 1%) who evaded our efforts to reach or assist them.

In our contacts with parents, the focal issues were much as reported in previous years. Basically parents were most concerned with forms of unacceptable behavior in the child, the distasteful aspects of parent-child relationships, the seeming lack of adequate progress in learning or broader and more pervasive forms of family conflict. Occasionally, the concern was specifically the marital relationship or some other family crisis which also had an impact upon the child. The overwhelming majority of these cases were dealt with in some manner short of referral, however, approximately 10% were referred to other agencies, clinics or private practitioners. For a view of the varying nature of our involvements with parents, including instances of referral, see the vignettes presented in Appendix B.

III. Consultation and In-Service Training to Teachers

Our fundamental concern has always been the overall development of the child but we have long been cognizant of the crucial role played by the teacher in furthering this process. This is all the more evident within the Saturday School program, a program which requires periodic home visits and seeks to bring school and home into a closer relationship. We have, then, a situation which asks parents for an opportunity to enter their private lives in return for an opportunity to develop a very special helping relationship for the child, if not the family. To this end, it has been our aim to promote the overall development of the teacher as well, recognizing that increments in teacher awareness, understanding and effectiveness with various children would enhance her lasting ability to play her role as a growth facilitator.

From the outset of the school year, we have held regular bi-weekly consultation hours for each teaching team. Each team had an opportunity for continuous contact with a specified consultant from this component, a relationship which was maintained throughout the school year.

The early contacts between teaching teams and consultants were most generally addressed to broad issues pertinent to child development. In time, many of the discussions focussed upon the specific problems encountered in working with a given child or family, but there was a consistent effort to draw from these experiences in such a way as to permit applicability to events which might transpire in another classroom at another time. The resultant close working relationship between teachers and consultants permitted a fairly early and cohesive appreciation of many families, some of whom came to be known more directly by way of later referral to the consultants.

These sessions were well attended by all teachers. In fact, except for a rare instance of illness, attendance was virtually complete with absences being essentially nil. The absences were so rare as to constitute less than 1% of the total hours possible.

During the course of the school year, teachers and consultants were actively engaged in the discussion of 208 different children. These cases, representing nearly 29% of the total population, are listed in Table 3. Obviously, some of these children were discussed on many occasions while others were involved in briefer or less frequent conferences. Some of these cases are represented in Appendix C, enclosed here as a sampling of the records maintained by each teacher on at least one child whose emotional outbursts were of continuing concern.

The number of cases referred for consultation purposes during the current year represents a sizeable portion of the total population but it also reflects a decided increase over previous years. Indeed, this aspect of our services has shown a steady increase over the past three years with each yearly increment being greater than 20%. Clearly, these findings portray the extent to which the teachers and consultants became increasingly successful in attending to virtually all cases within the target population.

The vast majority of referrals discussed with the consultant were initiated by the teacher. A much smaller proportion of these children were discussed through the initiative of the consultant following review of the child's record or observation in the classroom. In rare instances, children who were seemingly asymptomatic were referred by way of a parent's special concern regarding the child.

APPENDIX P (continued)

Pages 11, 12, and 13

TABLE III

Case Consultations with Teaching Staff

Bermuda School	006 007 009 011 017 018 025 027
Central School	004 005 011 015 016 018 021 023 026 027 028 029 031 032 038
Combs School	002 004 008 009 010 012 013 015 018 022
Commons Lane School	002 005 006 007 008 010 016 019 020 021 022 023 025 026 027 034
Cool Valley School	003 005 007 014 019 020 021 023 024 038 039
DeSmet School	002 004 007 008 012 014 017 020 024 026 029 031 035 040 043 045 051 054
Duchesne School	005 012 014 017 027 029 030 036 037 045 047
Graham School	001 004 007 008 010 012 015 017 018 023 025 026 029 030 031
Griffith School	001 007 015 018 020 021 032 037 038 045 048 049
Halls Ferry School	001 003 005 014 015 017 021 043 045 046 054
Lee Hamilton School	008 010 013 019 027 040
Mark Twain School	006 008 019 021 023 026 035 036 043 046 047
Parker Road School	001 003 007 008 014 018 021 026 029 034 037 039
Robinwood School	003 004 005 007 009 010 014 016 024 025 031 032 036 040 046 047 053
Vogt School	002 003 016
Walnut Grove School	009 011 012 013 015 016 017 025 036 038 042 048
Wedgwood School	002 004 010 013 017 020 021 027 034 036 039 048 053 055 058 061 062 069 072 075

Throughout the year, we were repeatedly impressed with the sensitivity and astuteness of the teaching staff in initiating referrals. While the range and severity of problems was varied, the appropriateness of the referrals was never in question. We are aware of no instance of an inappropriate referral. These impressions are further substantiated by the already described rather good agreement between teacher judgments of low adjustment in children and earlier screening assessments by the consultant.

By way of attempting to summarize the overall performance of teachers in relation to consultation services we have separated some of the most basic ingredients in this relationship for presentation in Table 4. Almost all of the teachers received ratings which placed them at the upper end of the continuum on most dimensions. Even the exceptions to this pattern, teachers with rather average ratings on one dimension or another, are found to have other, more commendable attributes which are reflected in their ratings on other dimensions. This is especially true for the all important matter of utilizing the suggestions of the consultant. In all, teacher performance was judged to be of exceptional caliber.

June 25, 1974

TABLE 4

TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO SERVICES OF E. H. SPECIALISTS

Teachers	A*	B	C	D
Bermuda				
a	4**	3	5	4
b	4	4	5	4
c	5	4	5	4
Commons Lane				
a	5	5	5	5
b	5	4	5	4
c	4	3	4	4
Duchesne				
a	4	3	4	4
b	5	5	5	5
c	4	5	5	5
Graham				
a	5	5	5	5
b	4	4	5	4
c	5	5	5	5
Walnut Grove				
a	4	4	5	4
b	4	5	5	4
c	3	4	4	4
d	4	4	5	5
Wedgwood				
a	4	3	4	4
b	5	4	5	5
c	3	3	4	4

*A - Teacher understood the role of consultant in the program
B - Teacher utilized consultant effectively
C - Teacher was helpful in conferences by sharing impressions of children and parents
D - Teacher was able to use suggestions of consultant with child

**Rating Scale: 1 - Poor; 2 - Fair; 3 - Good; 4 - Very Good; 5 - Excellent

APPENDIX A (E.H. Component)

FERGUSON-FLORISSANT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Parent-Child Early Education Program

PARENT SURVEY

1. Which of the problems discussed at the parent meetings were you most concerned with?

___ fearfulness

___ temper tantrums

___ crying

___ rivalry/jealousy

___ discipline/reward vs. punishment

___ shyness

___ bed wetting

___ sleeping problems

___ other

2. Did you find the discussion helpful?

1 2 3 4 5
not helpful — very helpful

3. Did you have the opportunity to talk about what you wanted?

1 2 3 4 5
no opportunity — much opportunity

4. Did the discussion reassure you on child rearing practices?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all reassuring — very reassuring

5. Did it help you to share ideas about child rearing with other parents?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all — very much

6. Did you get any new ideas on child rearing?

1 2 3 4 5
none — many

7. Would you want to have more such meetings?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all — definitely yes

APPENDIX B (E.H. Component)

Vignette #1

This case was brought to my attention in two ways: by the teacher (who saw the mother as anxious and over-concerned and the boy as somewhat shy), and by the parents who approached me after one of our group meetings with parents. Their concern was the boy's history of being overly active, having been told by a pediatrician he was hyperactive. If this were so, he isn't hyperactive now and is not on medication.

This boy was an active, colicky infant, a first child, and I sensed mother was very conscientious and consequently, possibly, anxious. The parent's *main concern* was the fact that neither this boy (4 years, 9 months), nor his brother (2 years, 6 months), can go without wetting the bed nightly. Both also wet themselves in the daytime almost daily. The older boy has never wet himself in *Saturday School*. He did, however, worry the parents considerably by apparently stimulating himself "sexually" by inserting a stick in and out of his rectum. The mother was very upset by this. The father was somewhat calmer. I discussed the problems, their possible origins, and how they might be handled in my original, rather lengthy interview with these parents. I suggested behavior modification techniques to combat the wetting of both children (the oldest had been trained but had regressed when his younger brother was born).

I spent some time instructing the parents about childhood sexuality and its differences from adult sexuality. Both caught on readily as they are intelligent and well motivated parents; a very nice young couple. We discussed how best to help the boy re: the self stimulation, and they seemed calmer. They were told they could call me and discuss this further if they needed more help. Also, if the problems persisted we would work on them and possibly refer them to a community agency if extensive help were needed.

Some five weeks later the parents contacted me requesting a conference. This conference was primarily to report the success they had achieved with both youngsters regarding the bed wetting. The oldest boy had stopped wetting both day and night. The younger boy was still wetting himself occasionally at night, but seldom. The sex play was no longer a problem, the mother was much more relaxed, and the boy, though a little shy in the group, was doing well in school.

Vignette #2

This is the case of an adopted girl, age five, who has a younger brother, age two-and-a-half. He is also adopted. Parents are older than the average in our program and both were born and reared in Ireland. This was *a relatively long-term case* involving many conferences with the teacher, observations of the child, conferences with parents, and conferences with the learning disability teacher. This case also involved conferences with the

Appendix B (E.H. Component)
Vignette #2(con)

family in their home and a suggested referral for help to a family agency. It also involved my helping parents better understand how to discuss adoption with the children which they felt had not been adequately handled by the adoption agency. I did this by discussing the issue with the parents (I had previously done adoption work), and helped them locate some literature on the subject.

This child was anxious, restless, over-active, tense and at times unruly, disobeying direction from teacher, and doing some minor stealing. Her mother described her as over-active, tense, but happy. The mother was a nice woman, but one who set high standards of achievement, both for herself and her children. Her daughter was always dressed as if going to a wedding, had her hair curled and looked "perfect" when she arrived at school. The mother turned out to be a perfectionist, who made herself quite anxious and at times depressed, by efforts to be "the perfect mother" to her two adopted children. She cried profusely in one interview with me about this, but steadfastly refused to seek counselling help for herself to help her relax. In one home visit her husband agreed that she "tried too hard, made herself tired and worried," but even this could not get her to seek counselling assistance.

Her fears and rigidity, some of which were cultural(e.g. children should be little adults when in school or when visitors were around are related to the Irish culture with which I am quite familiar).

The child did improve some. On one occasion near the end of the year when I had talked directly with both parents about the fact that she was too dressed up for school according to teachers and me, the girl came in much more casual clothes and seemed more comfortable herself. My final contact in June with the mother was for the purpose of encouraging her to seek counselling regarding her own anxiety and its relationship to the child's anxiety and restlessness. The mother was most cordial, but still resisted seeking help. Part of this was due to negative feelings she and her husband shared due to some rather unsuccessful group counselling they took part in at the agency where they had adopted the children. My efforts to offset this seem unsuccessful at this time, in terms of getting the mother to accept her need for help.

Vignette #3

This is an unusual case in that the child development consultant had only one contact with the mother who was involved in a rather bizarre situation. We had been alerted by the teacher some weeks before that there seemed to be some family turmoil,

Appendix B
Vignette #3(con)

but in discussing the case the child was doing well and the parents turmoil was portrayed by the teacher as possibly a sub-cultural phenomenon(some violence, which was accepted by both marital partners). The consultant accepted that and thinks now it was a mistake not to have intervened earlier.

In the last few weeks of school the child seemed to regress noticeably and the teacher became concerned enough that I contacted mother. She literally "jumped at the chance" to see me as soon as possible. She was seen the same day.

Mrs. Y. was a small woman, looked 20 rather than 26 or 27, her actual age. She was quite bright, very verbal, and extremely anxious for psychological assistance due to her own anxiety, depression and realistic fears.

She revealed that her husband had recently beaten her on two occasions in front of the children. He does this when under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol. He is on "speed" (amphetamines) and possibly other drugs. He has been involved in the drug culture for a number of months and has beaten her on a number of occasions. She had never signed a complaint against him though I believe she had a friend call the police on one occasion.

She has lost 60 pounds in 15 months, but never received a compliment from her husband on this. Part of the loss of weight was due to diet, part to fear and worry. She denied being on "speed" herself, except for prescriptions by her M.D. for weight loss. She had been beaten(again in front of the children) the day before. She was badly bruised on one shoulder, her arms and on her neck where he choked her. He had reportedly thrown her to the floor on her left shoulder where she displayed multiple ugly red bruises. She finally had called a lawyer that day who informed her she could get some sort of "peace bond" or other protective bond to either leave him or force him to leave the house. I encouraged her to follow this attorney's advice for her own protection, the mental health of her children and herself.

I strongly advised her to seek immediate counselling from a social agency for both emotional support and possible emergency financial assistance. She eagerly took the name and number of the social worker at the agency saying she would contact them as soon as possible.

She cried a great deal during the interview with me, thanked me profusely when she left and was given my telephone number in case further problems developed. She told the teacher later that our conference had really helped her.

Appendix B

Vignette #4

This youngster was one who "stood out like a sore thumb" as one in need of some sort of special help; even other 4 year olds were almost immediately aware that K was "different" somehow. He had a serious communication problem - his speech was so poor he could not be understood 90% of the time. He also exhibited unusual bodily movements, shaking his head, stamping his feet and waving his arms. On close observation these movements usually came about when K was frustrated in his attempts to communicate with someone. He also would cry when frustrated.

K is a rather tall lanky Negro boy. Some parents immediately thought of him as mentally retarded. K was seen by the learning disabilities specialist on our staff and the child development consultant was asked to observe in this case too. After one observation the consultant directly involved himself with K to demonstrate to the parents who were teacher aides how best to cope with his temperamental outbursts when frustrated. This involved calmly reassuring K guiding his hands in some tasks, encouraging his success and playing down his failures (e.g. when hammering nails in a board and missing - he is poorly coordinated too).

The consultant suggested that one high school volunteer be assigned to K each week to continue to reassure and support him emotionally in all activities. This was done and helped some. He also got regular help from Mrs. T., the learning disabilities specialist, in his home.

He was referred to a child guidance clinic for complete evaluation to determine which of his problems were primary and which should be dealt with first. We believed he had a strong drive for success and was much brighter than he could now demonstrate.

The clinic wanted to enroll him in their classes for the learning disabled who also were emotionally disturbed. The cost was high for the family and they did not clearly understand the post-diagnostic.

Mrs. T. and I did a post-diagnostic, using the clinic's report. We met in the family's home. They asked about other resources and I agreed to explore possibilities. I talked to the clinic about reducing their fee with no success. Another private school with an excellent program agreed to take K for one summer session for both remedial and diagnostic purposes to see what his needs were in the fall.

Appendix B
Vignette #4(con)

The family agreed to enroll K   in this plan. They were advised he could continue in this school in the fall if the school agreed or they could apply to the Public Special School District if they preferred. In any event, a comprehensive study had been done and even more would be known to plan knowledgeably for K   education after the summer session.

APPENDIX C (E.H. Component)

Behavioral Study of K

Sept. - Oct.

K looked and acted younger than 4 years. Her mother dressed her like a younger child and also her hair style was that of a 2 or 3 year old. She was 4 years old in July. On Saturday, K was not concerned or interested in other children or adults. She was concerned about herself. She cried often the first Saturdays and complained of her throat hurting and also wanted to go to the bathroom often. She was not interested in any activity for even a few minutes and we would find her in the hallway and other places away from her group. During together time, she wanted to be close by me most of the time. K crying seemed to be a means of getting attention, rather than a separation crying from her mother.

K was put with another child for home visits, one in which it seemed they would be working on the same skills. It did not work out. K was so distracted that she would leave the table or room often and soon it was encouraging the other child to do the same. During the first home visit, I found she had trouble matching colors.

Nov. - Dec.

By the middle of November, I started seeing K alone on home visits. This worked better, but of course she had the attention of two adults. We continued working on listening skills, scissors, crayons, parquetry blocks, lacing, etc. If she stayed with a task for a little while, then she could choose something to do as a reward. I suggested that her mother insist on her attending to a task for a few minutes at a time. Her mother seemed to be concerned about her, but at the same time, she would try to find excuses for her behavior. For example, when she was told about K crying, she thought she cried because she saw other children crying.

Jan. - Feb.

After coming back from Christmas vacation, K was sick or someone in the family was sick, so she missed about two home visits. There was really nothing accomplished during January. Also K missed some Saturdays. Sometimes her mother would say she had been up late the night before and she was too tired to go. She also seemed hesitant about helping. I felt she was embarrassed because of K behavior.

K seemed to have trouble keeping her eyes on the thing she was trying to do. For example, if she was cutting with scissors, soon she would be looking another direction, but still cutting away.

Appendix C
Behavioral Study of K (con)

March-April

K still did not know colors. She would say just any color anytime. We started counting and working on numerals 1, 2 and 3.

K improved a little on Saturdays. Her crying had stopped and after limiting her bathroom trips, this improved too. She still would not stay with her group, and always wanted to know when we were going outside.

May- Evaluation

	CA	MA	LA	VMI
	4-1	3-10	2-10	0
	4-9	4-8	5-4	3-2
gain	8 mo.	10 mo.	2 yr-6 mo.	3 yr-2 mo.

During the last home visit with K parents, I was told they had just found out that she does not see as well in the right eye. She may need to wear glasses.

Appendix C (con)

Behavioral Study of J

Before I had even met J his parents made an impression at our parent meeting in September. During our presentation, I noticed a man nodding and dozing in the second row. He and his wife came up to talk saying that "their kid" really had problems. Mother described it as a speech problem.

When I called for an appointment for our first home visit, mother was quite insistent that I schedule it during the noon hour so I could have lunch with them.

Both parents warmly welcomed me and introduced me to J 's little sister who appeared quite verbal. J said little, not even when his parents prodded "Tell Mrs. R.-- or Do-- for Mrs. R." Once in awhile he managed a weak grin. One of our activities that day was to pick up colored paper shapes with a clothespin. J enjoyed manipulating the clothespin, but would not tell me color or shape. At times the little sister gave the correct color response before J had time to respond.

I had lunch with the family - noticed how insistent they were that the children be neat and tidy. Father criticized what had been prepared for lunch- "the bread was toasted too much, there was too much salad." Conflict between the family members was obvious.

After receiving test results, I paired J with another child who had similar scores. It was decided we would meet for home visits weekly - alternate homes - both mothers to be present and participate. Both mothers were cooperative and ready for home visits, but at K. home, Mrs. K. would often be busy in the basement and after the group began working at her kitchen table, she excused herself and left. J seemed distractable, not interested and not even aware of the activities we were doing.

In following home visits, I encouraged Mrs. K. to join our group but she often sat just behind the table or in a position which made it difficult for her to participate. By November it was evident that M (J 's home visit partner) and his mother were faithfully working on home activities and M was showing much progress in identification of shapes, body parts, printing name, etc. During home visit M 's mother patiently participated and worked well with him. Mrs. K. felt uneasy when J didn't cooperate, repeatedly asked "what can I do with him." Seldom was there an attempt to do home activities. Mrs. K. explained that "he won't work for me" or I just can't get interested in doing that kind of work. I have little patience with kids."

By December M 's progress was so good that it became increasingly frustrating to J to sit there. With both mothers' consent, it was decided to split up the partnership and move each

Appendix C
Behavioral Study of J (con)

to a different home visit partner. J still did not give verbal answers but seemed to enjoy manipulative games and making things. When J refused to answer, mother ordered him to do it, threatened to "get the yardstick" or tell Daddy if you are not good for Mrs. R.

By January, J s partner was a quiet girl who also needed some encouragement to respond. Both J and mother seemed more relaxed at home vist because there was less competition. J 's counting ability consisted of "1-2-3" and he could not match sets and numberals beyond "3."

On one February home visit, J counted to 7. We were using candy hearts and he was told he could eat the same number he could count. J was responding favorably to incentives and positive comments. Mother still did not do assigned home activities but would often buy J sticker books or valentine books for him as a substitute.

Later in February, during a sequencing activity, he was ready to place a picture out of sequence. I said "no J " and with that comment he slipped off his chair and under the table. I used this incident to show Mrs. K. what effect a simple negative comment has on J . It is obvious that his behavior is a result of negative comments, criticism and rebellion to the parents' insisting.

In March, as I was leaving a home visit, J grabbed one of my gloves and decided he was going to keep it. Mrs. K. started to chase him and threatened to get a yardstick. After telling J why I needed the glove and could not leave without it, I offered him the choice of putting it back in my pocket or my case. He debated a short time and threw it in my case. When given a choice and without insistence, he will respond.

The family is much aware now of J 's need for praise and the effect of negative behavior, however they still have many family problems to be solved. They have agreed to family counseling but are concerned it will take too much time. J 's response to others is very dependent upon his parents'response to him. The surest way to help J is to help his parents accept themselves and learn to work together as a family unit.

APPENDIX Q

FINAL REPORT

Parent-Child Early Education Program
Ferguson-Florissant School District
655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

Psychological Services
Component for Exceptional Children

Prepared by:
Allan C. Yater, Ph.D.
Psychological Consultant
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri
63103

Date Submitted:
June 17, 1974

This report summarizes the activities and services provided to the Parent-Child Early Education Program of the Ferguson-Florissant School District by the Component for Children with Educationally-related Developmental Problems, during the 1973-1974 program year.

The roles, functions, and thrust of activities of the professional staff of this component have been outlined in detail in the 1973-74 Interim Report (dated March 8, 1974), and the operating procedures which were developed and implemented around each of the major areas were discussed in that report. In general, the pattern of services rendered followed the developments of previous years of this program, with one major modification being implemented this year. To facilitate and enhance administrative and operational functions, services provided by the subcomponents for learning disabilities and slow-learning children were combined under a single administrative unit. Underlying rationale behind this change included considerations such as factors of increased collaboration and cooperation among consultation staff, greater effectiveness in liaison with teaching staff, enhanced consistency and continuity of services provided to children and other staff personnel, and elimination of duplicated services. Throughout the program year, it was the opinion of the staff that the results of this administrative merger were positive, yielding the desired outcomes, and recommendations are made to continue this administrative pattern in subsequent programs.

The component staff included a psychologist, special educator, two communication disorder specialists, and a consultant psychologist who served as coordinator of the component. Services provided by these consultants during the program year will be presented in the following sections of this report.

Psychological Examiner. The services provided by the psychological examiner were primarily of a diagnostic and consultative nature. Diagnostically, children identified through preliminary screening procedures as being in need of further evaluation for educationally-related problems in development were referred to the psychologist for additional psychological testing. Other children who in the course of their program revealed learning or adjustment difficulties were also referred for evaluation. Toward the end of the program year, eighteen of these children received a follow-up re-evaluation by the psychologist. As a corollary to his diagnostic functions, the psychologist met with parents of children evaluated for the purpose of communicating results of the evaluations, and parents were also counseled with respect to child-rearing attitudes and practices. In ten instances, the psychologist conducted home-visits for the purpose of gaining further diagnostic information through direct observation of parent-child interactions. Observations of children participating in group settings were also conducted; During the period extending from February through June, 1974, the psychologist attended seventeen Saturday School programs. Finally, two contacts with other agencies in the community were made by the psychologist for purposes of additional diagnostic information and for possible referral information.

In addition to these diagnostic services, the psychologist participated in three in-service educational programs for the teaching staff, and attended a total of twenty-two staff conferences held with either the coordinator, special educator, and/or communication disorder specialists.

Communication Disorder Specialists: The responsibilities of the two communication disorder specialists included diagnostic testing and identification of children in need of specialized speech and/or language therapy, and the provision of such therapies as indicated. A total of nine children were seen for individual therapy sessions designed to promote better speech and/or language development. Nine children with multiple handicaps (e.g., severely visually impaired, moderate hearing problems, epilepsy, expressive aphasia, Down's Syndrome, spina bifida, hydrocephaly, etc.) were also seen for individual therapy. Another twenty-five children were seen for language development therapy. Therapy was designed to enhance concept development, auditory and visual association skills, auditory and visual memory, and verbal expression.

The communication disorder specialists met with teachers of children in therapy at least once each week to discuss progress and to make recommendations with respect to additional needs of the children. Consultation with parents of these children also took place on a weekly basis so that communication channels between therapists and parents were developed and maintained throughout the course of each child's program.

With respect to diagnostic evaluations, a total of 101 children were seen for testing by the communication disorder specialists at the beginning of the program year. Seventy-two children were initially identified as having problems relating to learning disabilities, and twenty-nine demonstrated problems relating to speech. Another six children were scheduled for testing, but were found to be untestable. At the end of the program year, thirty-eight children were re-evaluated for purposes of determining their status following the various interventions provided.

To facilitate future educational and therapeutic programs for the children seen by the communication disorder specialists, 28 contacts with other agencies in the community were made for fifteen of the children concerned. Further, throughout the program year, the communication disorder specialists made it a point to meet with the prospective kindergarten teachers who would be working with these children next year in order to establish appropriate expectations with respect to the needs of these children.

In addition to the diagnostic, therapeutic, and consultation services provided, the communication disorder specialists participated in a number of in-service educational programs for teachers. One in-service training session was initiated and conducted by the specialists, and they served as participants in a number of sessions conducted by other consultants to the program.

Coordinator of Component: The roles and functions of the coordinator of this component were primarily concerned with direct consultative services to the Program Director, staff, and other professional consultants. In addition to supervision of the psychological examiner, communication disorder specialists, and special educator, the coordinator conducted numerous staff conferences dealing with diagnosis and educational planning of children, and participated in the selection of diagnostic screening and evaluation instruments, the review of test findings, the placement of children in appropriate learning situations, and in the follow-up of children's progress.

A major thrust of the coordinator's efforts was concerned with in-service education and training of teachers in the program. Numerous presentations were made throughout the year covering a variety of topics, including diagnostic considerations with preschool children; child growth and development; the slow-learning child; psychomotor development in young children;

concept formation in young children; normal deviations in development; the Slosson Intelligence Test as a screening instrument for young children; teaching by educational objectives; etc. In addition to these formal presentations, the coordinator met frequently with the teaching teams to discuss the progress and status of children in their programs, and to provide suggestions for alternative approaches and strategies in working with problemmatic children.

Another major thrust of the coordinator's efforts was in the area of dissemination of information relating to the program. A number of presentations were made to local PTA groups and to groups of kindergarten and first-grade teachers from schools within the District. As a representative from the program, the coordinator presented a paper at the annual conference of the Crucial Early Years conducted by the school district, and also presented a four-session in-service educational program for teachers in the district which was sponsored in conjunction with the University of Missouri at St. Louis. In the same vein, the coordinator prepared a symposium concerning presentation of findings from the longitudinal study of children participating in the program and submitted it to the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) for possible inclusion in their annual convention program in the Spring of 1975.

Additional involvement of the coordinator was concerned with various independent research studies designed to examine the utility of various screening instruments employed in the program. These studies are in the process of preparation for publication in appropriate journals.

Evaluation by Component: As mentioned earlier in this report, the roles, functions, and services encompassed within this component evolved over the years of this program since its inception. During this time, every effort was made to objectify processes and procedures as much as possible so as to make them amenable to objective evaluation with respect to their functional utility, reliability, and validity. At the same time, however, it was recognized that processes and procedures, once established, may tend to become crystallized and may, at that point, become detrimental to subsequent goals and needs of the program as they may arise. Therefore, a deliberate attempt was made at the very outset of the program to build in mechanisms allowing for change in the face of indicated needs. Such mechanisms included open and consistent channels of communication between staff members; immediate responsiveness to changing needs of staff and families served; development of leadership among staff members and recognition of leadership by provision of opportunities for increased responsibilities in planning and implementation of various aspects of the program; development of an atmosphere conducive to change when change is needed; and development of expectancies among staff that change is expected and will occur. The effectiveness of such mechanisms in operation in this program can be illustrated in the following example: Early in the program it was recognized that the teachers who remained with the program over the years would continue to grow professionally in competencies and expertise, and that such growth would require differential staffing patterns in subsequent years, increasingly sophisticated content in presentations during in-service educational sessions, and more elaborate and complex measures of the effectiveness of their efforts with children in the program. The current program year validated these expectations when once considers the quantity and quality of the efforts of the teachers and consultant specialists. In the first year of the program, teachers were concerned with issues of how to approach preschool children in testing and evaluation sessions, how to approach and manage handicapped children in the classroom, and how to approach parents of handicapped children. Gradually, as the teachers mastered the skills necessary in these areas, their concerns moved to another level of sophistication and developed around collateral issues such as the validity and reliability of the results obtained through their assessment and evaluation efforts; the consideration of alternative ways of approaching children with varying kinds and degrees of disabilities in the classroom;

and the seeking of skills which would enhance their relationships with parents of handicapped children so that they could be more effective in their interactions with parents. During the current year, with these prior concerns alleviated through the acquisition of new skills and competencies, the teachers evidenced a desire and readiness to inquire into more complex areas of their work. In the area of child assessment and evaluation, they were, this year, concerned about differential diagnosis of children and raised significantly more astute questions with the professional consultants with respect to such things as alternative diagnostic approaches to children whose disabilities were such that they could not be tested on formal instruments, or methods for differentiating the behavior of children who might be encountering an adjustment problem from the child with a perceptual disability.

This example is intended to reflect indications of considerable professional growth on the part of the teachers who had remained with the program since its implementation. This same growth over the years, however, necessitated changes in the program's structure, processes, and procedures in order to accommodate the emerging needs of the teaching staff. It was felt that the built-in flexibility of the program resulting from anticipation of such changes in the staff allowed the program to be sensitive and responsive to these changing needs, not only of the staff, but of the children and parents served. In the opinion of the professional consultants, it was felt that this current program year reflected the culmination of accumulated effort over prior years, and that the dividends were reaped in this model year which could well serve as the basis for other programs concerned with the early education of exceptional children.